THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

So difficult is it to find a meaning in the Transfiguration of our Lord, a meaning at all correspondent with the strangeness of the event itself, that one welcomes any independent effort to render it intelligible. Such an effort has been made by Miss Evelyn UNDERHILL.

Miss UNDERHILL has written a large volume on mysticism, giving it the title of *The Mystic Way* (Dent; 12s. 6d. net). It is a volume of sufficient importance to make it rank with the volumes of Baron Friedrich von HÜGEL and Professor Rufus M. JONES, as one of the three great popular expositions of mysticism of recent years. Its claim to originality rests on the fact that it is, above all else, an exposition of the mysticism of the New Testament.

But its originality is also its weakness. The New Testament is discovered to be full of mysticism. The apostles are mystics, one and all, and little else. Even our Lord Himself is represented as passing through all the stages of mystical experience. And every mystical experience is explained psychologically. There is nothing in the miracles of the New Testament that cannot be expressed in terms of modern psychology.

Among the rest the Transfiguration is explained psychologically. No attempt is made to find its place in the life of Jesus, to measure its influence on His mind, or to estimate its importance for His work. It is treated simply as one of a group of incidents, prominent in the Synoptics, which have their parallels in the lives of the saints. These incidents are examples of the foreknowledge of events, such as the announcements of the Passion, of the betrayal of Judas and the denial of Peter; or they are cases of clairvoyance, as when it is said 'Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves'; or they are instances of levitation, such as the walking on the sea. The Transfiguration is a case of ecstasy.

'The kernel of this story—no doubt elaborated by successive editors, possessed by that passion for the marvellous which Jesus unsparingly condemned—seems to be the account of a great ecstasy experienced by Him in one of those wild and solitary mountain places where the soul of the mystic is so easily snatched up to communion with supreme Reality.' Such ecstasies, says Miss UNDERHILL, were probably a frequent feature of those nights of prayer which supported the active life of Jesus. This was the way in which His communion with the Father expressed itself. The only difference is that those ecstasies were experienced in solitude, this in the presence of Peter, James, and John.

To Miss UNDERHILL, therefore, the vital fact is that the Transfiguration took place while He was praying, although that fact is recorded by Luke alone. By 'prayer' she understands 'profound and deliberate absorption in the Divine Life.' That absorption was the immediate cause of the transfigured bodily state. The three disciples had just heard the testimony given to His Messiahship. One of them had uttered that testimony. The atmosphere was charged with wonder and enthusiasm. In such an atmosphere the human brain is at a hopeless disadvantage. Moreover, they were on the verge of sleep. How inevitable that their minds, steeped in Old Testament imagery, should body forth just such a vision as is described, the moment that their Master's ecstasy in prayer was perceived by them.

But are we not told that Moses and Elijah appeared talking with Jesus? To the disciples they did so appear. Not to Jesus. There is no suggestion that Jesus Himself saw the patriarch or the prophet. But how natural that the disciples should believe that they saw them. 'As the devout Catholic is sure that the saint in ecstasy talks with Christ and the Virgin, so these devout Jews are sure that their Master talks with the supreme lawgiver and supreme seer of the race.'

That is the vision. After the vision, the audition. 'There came a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son: hear ye him.' The voice tells them nothing new. It simply affirms, in almost identical language, the fact of 'divine sonship' which Jesus Himself had experienced at His baptism, and no doubt communicated to His friends. Then Miss Underhill concludes. And she concludes by saying that the whole narrative is natural. 'Given the fact of a collective consciousness, developed in its lowest form in all crowds, and often appearing upon higher intellectual and moral levels in mystical and religious societies, this episode should offer no difficulty to the psychologist.'

What are the things that are essential to the making of a good missionary? They are these three—Sending, Suffering, Sympathy. The Rev. Cuthbert McEvoy, M.A., has written a book on the growth of Christianity, calling it *The Great Embassy* (James Clarke & Co.; 1s. net). In the beginning of the book he gives these three as the contents of that easily uttered word 'Missionary'—sending, suffering, sympathy.

First, Sending. For that lies in the etymology of the word. A mission is a sending, a missionary is one sent. Now sending is motion; it is motion outwards. And as motion involves an origin and a goal, Mr. McEvoy discovers that the missionary is sent by God, and he is sent to God.

He is sent by God. That is his origin. 'Ye are not your own'; 'Not I, but Christ that liveth in me'; 'Paul, an apostle (it is the word missionary) not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.'

And he is sent to God. 'From the great deep to the great deep he goes.' Mr. McEvoy again quotes the Apostle Paul: 'This one thing I do. . . . I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'

Next, Suffering. This idea is not in the word etymologically. It has been imported into it. Experience has so closely associated suffering with the missionary that it has come to be part of the word's connotation. For the missionary is invariably one who is sent from conditions of ease to conditions of hardship. 'The missionary spirit prays in Father Damien that the comfortable priesthood of Louvain may be exchanged for the leper island of Molokai. It drives F. W. Crossley to leave the pleasant suburb for the squalor of Ancoats. The missionary spirit quits the Throne in order to bear the Cross.

Lastly, Sympathy. The courier and the trader may be sent, they may be sent into suffering. It

is the combination of three that makes the missionary; and of the three the greatest is sympathy.

It is sympathy with the message. The courier carries his message in his dispatch-box; the missionary carries his message in his soul. When the courier delivers his message he delivers something quite apart from himself. But when the missionary delivers his message he pours out part of himself and yields up something of his own life. 'My little children, of whom I travail again in birth until Christ be formed in you.' When the courier has delivered his message he may go to his hotel and his dinner; he may spend the night in the ball-room or at the theatre. But when the missionary has delivered his message he keeps his body under lest when he has preached to others he himself should be a castaway.

It is also sympathy with the recipients of the message. This is the theme of a remarkable article which opens *The International Review of Missions* for April. The author of the article, who is simply called 'a Missionary on Holiday,' knows how exacting are the conditions attaching in modern times to the Christian ministry. But he has come to realize that the demands made upon the missionary are greater far than the demands made upon the minister. And the most exacting demand of all is this, that the missionary should be in sympathy with the recipients of his message.

Speaking as a missionary, he says, 'Ever and anon we ourselves are oppressed by the sense of failure. Some one has said that "missions would be a very wonderful achievement if it were not for the missionaries," and even if our own hearts have never brought us to so bitter a confession, the judgments we are sometimes tempted to form of a reasonable proportion of our brethren suggest that there is a great truth in the saying, a truth which perchance should suggest certain judgments upon ourselves. The great tragedy in life is that most men's work is spoilt, not by others, but by their own hand.'

Whereupon he recalls what Mr. A. G. BRADLEY says in his lectures on *Shakespearean Tragedy*. And there is tragedy in the very recollection. 'We find,' says Mr. BRADLEY, 'that the comparatively innocent hero still shows some marked imperfection or defect, irresolution, precipitancy, pride, credulousness, excessive simplicity, excessive susceptibility to sexual emotions, and the like. These defects or imperfections are certainly, in the wide sense of the word, evil, and they contribute decisively to the conflict and catastrophe. And the inference is obvious. The ultimate power which shows itself disturbed by this evil and reacts against it, must have a nature alien to it. *Indeed its action is so vehement and relentless that it would seem to be bent on nothing short of good in perfection, and to be ruthless in its demand for it.*'

'How true,' says this nameless missionary—nameless that he may speak for all missionaries—'how true,' he says, 'those words are of the men we know! How many of us know them to be true of ourselves! In our service there are just such instances of "marked imperfections or defects." In our case, too, the result is tragedy, and often the result seems out of proportion to the cause. We notice sometimes that in a curious way the first are last and the last first: men to whom every human judgment awards the palm of victory are failures in the Christian service of a foreign nation. Just as the microbes that produce cholera or sleeping-sickness seem absurdly small to cause so far-reaching a disturbance of the human body, so our work is often ruined in whole or part by imperfections we do not dignify enough to reckon, much less to extirpate. Meanwhile the ultimate power "would seem to be bent on nothing short of good in perfection."'

Now that form of weakness or imperfection which more than any other seems to this mission-

ary to be the cause of failure, is inability to enter into complete sympathy with the life of another race. Nor does he think that there has been progress in this matter as there has been in other matters which touch the missionary's life and work. He is not so ignorant as to blame the missionary. Send any minister or other Christian into the place of the missionary and he would behave exactly as the missionary does. Two things he names as the occasion of it, race pride and temptation.

It is due, he says, to race pride, the race pride of the whole Western Christian world. And it is due to temptation. 'Many a missionary who wanted to be friendly passes through successive stages of surprise and disillusionment till in despair he abandons all hope of real friendship. The missionary most sympathetic to the people of the country in which he works must often have felt that he would give anything to be able as a native to protest against the carelessness, aloofness, and discourtesy which from the native side tend to alienate the incoming recruit.'

Is this the confession of one morbid missionary hiding himself and asserting ubiquity by the suppression of his name? He quotes the deliberate judgment of the Edinburgh Conference, expressed in the fourth volume of the official report: 'They felt a strange antipathy to colour, dirt, vermin, and ugly faces. Unintentionally they showed that antipathy in their manners. The alert-eyed natives saw it. Without at first saying anything disrespectful, they quietly gave them outward obedience. But they never gave them respect, never opened their hearts to them. The teachings of such missionaries fell flat. They filled a certain niche in the roll of station members, but they never had influence for good. Rather, some of them by their harsh words or curt manners brought only evil to the missionary name.'

Where is the remedy to be found? It is to be found, says this missionary, in the diligent study of Scripture and the following of Christ. Alongside the Edinburgh report he places Christ's intercessory prayer—'Neither pray I for these only,' and the new commandment—'that ye love one another'; he places 'love's condemnation of the want of love,' found in the opening of the hymn of love, in the thirteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians; and, above all, he places St. Paul's ideal for the Church in Colossians (3^{11}), 'Where there cannot be Greek or Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all and in all.' And then he comes to the example of Christ.

Christ our Master, he says, can teach us where we have failed to reveal Him, and one characteristic of the gospel story is especially relevant. It is His use of the title 'Son of Man.' 'Though all His life is full of rebuke and inspiration, there are few things recorded of Him that can teach us so much as His use of the title "Son of Man."'

'Our Lord was dealing with that Messianic expectation which represented for the elect of Israel the gateway of thought into a world of beauty, order and righteousness, where injustice was swept away and death had no sting. The promise and the centre of this transformed life was the Messiah. Hebrew thought in regard to the Messiah had been vivid and concrete from the outset, with the result that the Jews possessed in the rolls of their prophets many a rich and inspiring name for Him that was to come. How closely those terms were interwoven with the Messianic conception in the thought of the time is shown by the way in which the crowds were ready to use them to give point to their praises. Others of those titles were cited by the Apostles and taken up gladly by the early Church. Commentators returned to them again and again, and writers of hymns at every period of the Christian era founded their praises upon them: "Son of Jesse," "Son of David," "Emmanuel," and a score of others, we know them ourselves; for we love to use them

even though the Jewish history from which they spring lives for us no longer. But—note the importance of the suggestion—He used nothing for Himself but the title "Son of Man."'

There is an Old Testament title which we should have expected Him to prefer. He meditated much on the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. Would it not have been most fitting if He had adopted the name of 'the Servant of the Lord'? The deepest thought of the early Church found in that figure and the passages connected with it just the type of imagery in which its experience could most easily embody itself. Yet Christ Himself never claimed that name. 'Is it not significant,' says this missionary, 'of the all-roundness of His identification with man, and of that acceptance of the common joy of humanity revealed to us most clearly in His presence at the Galilean marriage, that He refused to summarize His relation to humanity in the figure of the marred and suffering servant? Plainly and without qualification He was the "Son of Man."'

In this title, then, this missionary finds the needful guidance in the difficulty before him. And he believes that the whole Church, at home and abroad, will find it. The home and foreign Church must be summoned to a corporate striving after the mind that was in Christ Jesus. He adopts the old Hebrew idiom and says that there are those who would be 'sons of £500 a year,' there are those who would be 'sons of fine raiment,' and there are those who would be 'sons of social position.' The true Christian must be ambitious enough to become a 'son of man.'

The Creation of the World was an act of love. We say, God so loved the world that He gave His Son to redeem it. We can also say, God so loved the world that He created it. For this is the one thing that we know of God absolutely and without any qualification: Everything He does is done out of love.

How could He love the world before He created it? The answer is easy. We ourselves are able to love those whom we have never seen, 'Whom not having seen, ye love.' 'Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' We can love those who never existed. We can love Colonel Newcome; we can love Jeanie Deans. It is Dickens that tells how in the very creation of his characters he lived with them and loved them. We can do it by the exercise of the imagination. The imagination of God is foreknowledge. They actually exist to Him although they have not yet been born. God so loved the world, the world of to-day, you and me, as to send His Son into it to save it two thousand years ago.

Moreover, God does not need to wait for times and seasons. His time is always ready. He is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever; and yesterday, to-day, and for ever are the same to Him. We love when the time comes and the person, not perhaps the first person that comes. The first person that comes may not carry the key. What does Anna Bunston say?

> O leave the lonely fortress of my heart,
> I cannot yield to thee;
> But merrily the gates had swung apart
> If thou hadst held the key.

But we all carry the key to God's heart, the first comer as well as the last. 'That whosoever believeth'—that was the reach of the love that brought about the Incarnation. That whosoever liveth, in all the ages of the world, that was the reach of the love that caused the Creation.

Now the actual Creation was the work of the Son of God. This is one of the most unexpected of all God's revelations. And it is the more extraordinary that we do not owe it to Christ Himself. We owe it entirely to the Apostles. Wherever they obtained it the Apostles have it with certainty. Take St. Paul—'who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; for by him

were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him' (Col $1^{15.16}$). Take the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews—'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds' (He $1^{1.2}$). Take St. John—'All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made' (Jn 1^{3}).

How did they come by this unexpected knowledge? We need not hesitate to answer. By the Spirit interpreting to them their experience of Christ. They found by experience that He had power over nature; the winds and the waves obeyed Him. They discovered that Redemption is Creation, a new Creation. A second Creation involves a first, and there is a direct continuity of operation between the two. But above all things, they learned that the only expression of God to man is by the Son of God. 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' It was for that reason that they recognized the appropriateness of the title Logos or Word for Christ. St. Paul has it that the thought of the Creation is God the Father's, the carrying out of that thought the Son's: 'To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him' (1 Co 8^{6}).

How should the Creation be described? There are two ways possible, the scientific and the artistic, or the way of the intellect and the way of the imagination.

The scientific way seems the more likely. But there are difficulties. If it is perfectly accurate it will be unintelligible. For if it is perfectly accurate, it will not represent the earth as the centre of the solar system, and it will not say it is flat. But who will persuade the ancient Israelites of these things, or even make them intelligible to them? Again, if the account of the Creation is intelligible and credible at the time of its first publication, how soon will it be out of date! There is no kind of literature that passes so quickly out of date as the literature of physical science. The writer had occasion recently to refer to one of the Bridgewater Treatises, and found he had not a copy. Immediately afterwards he saw the whole set of thirteen volumes offered in an antiquarian catalogue for a few shillings. He ordered them. What was his surprise to discover, on opening the parcel, that they were uniformly and most handsomely bound and as spotless as when they left the hands of the binder. For there is no demand for the Bridgewater Treatises now.

But the greatest difficulty in the way of a scientific account of the Creation is that it would leave out God. For science has to do only with material things. Let us make no mistake about that. And that we may make no mistake, let us quote the words of Professor Tyndall: 'It ought to be known and avowed, that the physical philosopher, as such, must be a pure materialist. His inquiries deal with matter and force, and with them alone.' These words may be read on the 92nd page of his *Fragments of Science*.

The story of the Creation, then, must be addressed to the imagination. If it is addressed to the imagination and is true—true imaginatively—it will be true always and everywhere. We do not read the Bridgewater Treatises any longer, but we read Homer still, and Dante. And George Frederick Watts is well within the mark when he says that a great painting should be a great painting two thousand years hence.

In any case, this is the way of telling the story of the Creation that has been chosen. It is a work of art. Who the artist was, or who the

artists were, we do not stay now to inquire. Those who have gone into this matter assure us that the account of the Creation which we have in Genesis, is a slow growth, that the imagination of many men, and men of more than one nation, has been at work upon it. But there it stands, a work of art, beautiful, wonderful, impressive, and true for all time. Let us listen for a moment to Haeckel.

'The Mosaic history of creation, since, in the first chapter of Genesis, it forms the introduction to the Old Testament, has enjoyed, down to the present day, general recognition in the whole Jewish and Christian world of civilisation. Its extraordinary success is explained, not only by its close connection with Jewish and Christian doctrines, but also by the simple and natural chain of ideas which runs through it, and which contrasts favourably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the ancient nations. First, God creates the earth as an inorganic body; then He separates light from darkness, then water from the dry land. Now the earth has become habitable for organisms, and plants are first created, animals later; and among the latter the inhabitants of the water and of the air first, afterwards the inhabitants of the dry land. Finally, God creates man, the last of all organisms, in His own image, and as ruler of the earth. Two great and fundamental ideas, common also to the non-miraculous theory of development, meet us in the Mosaic hypothesis of creation with surprising clearness and simplicity—the idea of separation or differentiation, and the idea of progressive development or perfecting.' So Haeckel, a quite unexpected witness.

There is no controversy therefore with science. And we are open to consider without prejudice what method Christ adopted in the Creation of the world. We are open to ask whether it was a single act, a series of acts, or a slow process. And when modern science tells us that it was a slow process, we are not disturbed. One thing only we demand; God must be acknowledged to be always present. We have God at the beginning: we must have God all through. Every step in the evolution or development must be taken with God's co-operation. We must be able to say to the plant and to the animal: 'Work out your own salvation, for it is God that worketh in you.'

Now, whatever the method employed in the Creation of the world may be, it is all due to one mind and one hand. Does St. Paul say that the plan is the Father's? then there is unity in that plan throughout. Does he say that the work is the Son's? then there is perfect harmony with the plan in every step of it. 'Earth's crammed with heaven,' says Mrs. BROWNING:

> Earth's crammed with heaven,
> And every common bush afire with God;
> But only he who sees, takes off his shoes,
> The rest sit round it and pluck blackberries.

Well, at least they know where they will find blackberries. They know that they must go to a blackberry bush for them. They know that the world is a cosmos, not a chaos, and that they can never gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles.

This 'uniformity of nature' is much studied in our day. And a strange use has been made of it. Because God is a God of order He is denied the name of God. If He had made things higgledy-piggledy no offence would have been found in Him. For then there would have been no 'laws of nature,' and God could have 'interfered' as much as He had a mind to. Whether He will 'interfere' or not is another matter. We may safely say that He will not 'interfere' except to bring order out of any disorder which we have wrought in the earth. But when the fulness of the time is come we must be prepared to allow the Creator of the world to 'interfere' with His world so mightily as to become man and live in it.

Christ created a world into which He should be

able to come. Did He also create a world into which He should *have* to come? We may be sure He did, for He is not short-sighted. But let us be perfectly clear about this, that it was not the fault of His Creation. What it was due to we know. It was due to the freedom of choice with which He endowed man in order that he might be man. And we know that the freedom of choice is the one insoluble mystery in the world. But when the world was created, God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good.

It was very good. So said the Creator Himself. It is the way Christ spoke of His work when He was on earth. No mere man describes his work in that way. The greater the artist the less is he satisfied with his work. But Christ rejoiced in the perfection of His work at the beginning, and He rejoiced in its perfection all through. 'Consider the lilies,' He said on earth; 'consider the lilies of the field; Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.' And He Himself had made them.

No doubt there is evil in the world; there is suffering; and sometimes death is painful and prolonged. No doubt 'the whole creation groaneth.' It is the issue of choice. It is the one insoluble mystery. But it never destroys the fact that the Creation was an act of love, and that love will be met by love before the end comes.

Moreover, the Creation includes Christ. When He created the world He created it as a place to live in. More than that, He created it as a place to die in. He created His own body for the Cross. So every sorrow should recall Him, as Katherine TYNAN has it beautifully in her parable of the April evening. Every sorrow should recall Him, for He is in it, that by His own sorrow He may turn it into joy.

All in the April evening,
  April airs were abroad;
The sheep with their little lambs
  Passed me by on the road.

The sheep with their little lambs
  Passed me by on the road;
All in the April evening
  I thought on the Lamb of God.

The lambs were weary, and crying
  With a weak, human cry.
I thought on the Lamb of God
  Going meekly to die.

Christ as Creator is the secret of all our interest in Christ. And it is the secret of all Christ's interest in us.

It is the secret of His interest in us, He created the world and knows it intimately. 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?' He had heard the seller cry his wares in the Galilean bazaars. 'Two for a farthing,' and He had made them! 'Two for a farthing': that was man's estimate. 'Not a sparrow falleth to the ground': that was God's. If He has this interest in the sparrow, He has as much interest as this in us.

He created man, man's body, the human hand; and He knew that He Himself would with such a hand still the sea and drive the traders out of the temple. He knew what the hand of man could do. He created man's hand, and He knew that the hand of man would drive the nails through His own.

He created the world and gave it its 'laws.' He knew that the time would come when He would submit to these laws. He would be hungry, thirsty, and tired; He would sleep; He would die. He had a great interest in the world when He came into it, for He had made it and called it 'very good,' and He came into it now to be crucified.

And our interest in Christ is interest in our Creator. We sometimes put the Cross before the Creation, but the Creation is first. A

certain man had two sons before any of them needed redemption. 'I will arise and go to my father' before he knew that his father would see him afar off and run and kiss him. More than that, the Cross depends on the Creation for its value. It is the Creator on the Cross that gives the Cross its value. The Cross is weakness, the Creation is strength. It is not weakness we cry for. It is weakness in strength.

'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for! my flesh, that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me,
Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: a Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!

A Recent Find of Jewish Measures.

By A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the University of Edinburgh.

In the absence of a single known specimen of the ancient Hebrew measures of length and capacity, students of the subject have hitherto been almost entirely dependent for the values of the measures mentioned in the Old and New Testaments on the equations of these with the better known measures of Greece and Rome found in Josephus and other early writers. A special interest accordingly attaches to a double series of actual measures of capacity discovered a few years ago by the Assumptionist Fathers in Jerusalem. A full account of all the finds is given by Père Germer-Durand, well known to readers of the *Revue Biblique*, in a lecture on 'Mesures de capacité des Hébreux au temps de l'évangile,' published with illustrations in a small volume entitled *Conférences de Saint-Étienne*, 1909–1910 (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte 90).[1]

The measures in question belong to two distinct sets, one used apparently for liquids, the other for grain, flour, and the like. The first set consists of four stone vessels found at various dates from 1889 to 1907, and standing to each other in the proportion of 1, 2, 3, 4. The largest of the four, which we propose to distinguish as A, is 'a large stone vase of conical form, furnished with two projecting ears,' and is said to measure 21·25 litres, which is 37·42 pints.[2] The measures, B, C, D, are, as has been said, respectively $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{1}{4}$ of A, and their content can be calculated accordingly.

The important question now emerges: Which of the known Jewish measures of capacity do these vases represent? There is no mark of identification, it should be said, on any of the four. Unfortunately Père Germer-Durand has gone for his identification to the Oxford *Helps to the Study of the Bible*, where the values are taken from a French work published as far back as 1859. The result is that the largest measure (A), although containing only $21\frac{1}{4}$ litres, say $37\frac{1}{2}$ pints, is identified with the bath, and B, C, and D with the fractional parts thereof.

But this is little more than one-half of the size of the bath, and of its equivalent dry measure the ephah, as given by modern metrologists. The latter, it is true, have been almost wholly guided, for the reason stated above, by the numerous indications of the values of the Jewish measures in terms of the Roman and Attic measures found in such writers as Josephus and Jerome, and in the treatises of early writers on metrology. By all

[1] A summary of the lecture, with illustrations of the measures, by Mr. Herbert Loewe appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* for August 16, 1912. Excellent illustrations without explanations were given in *The World's Work*, for December 1912.

[2] It should be stated at the outset that the quantities given by the lecturer cannot be those obtained in every case by actual measurement. No ancient measures ever constructed were so mathematically exact! The figures given clearly represent the *theoretical* values, deduced presumably from that of the largest measure. But even in this case the value is only given to the nearest large fraction of a litre. This method introduces an element of uncertainty as to the identification of the smallest measures mentioned below.

these the log, the smallest unit of capacity in the Jewish system, is equated with the Attic xestes and the Roman sextarius, as the bath (72 logs) is equated with the metretes (72 xestai). Now it is beyond dispute that the two former measures differed but little from an English pint, making the Jewish bath and the Attic metretes to contain something like nine imperial gallons, less or more. No doubt these equations were those found to be sufficiently accurate for everyday purposes, not those of the scientific metrologist who tells us that a pint = ·56793 of a litre! But it is surely self-evident that a metretes of *circa* 72 pints could never have been equated with a bath of only 37.

The fact is that the new Jerusalem measures represent only *the half of the measures with which they have been identified by their finders.* In other words, A must represent the ½ bath of 36 logs; B, ⅜ bath of 27 logs; C, ¼ bath of 18 logs; and D, ⅛ bath of 9 logs. The clue to the names of the new measures is probably to be found in Epiphanius, who speaks of a 'sacred' hin of 9 xestai or logs (see Hultsch, *Griech. u. römische metrologie*, 2 ed. p. 450). Accordingly, until further evidence is available, the new measures may be provisionally identified as one, two, three, and four sacred hins, the last being also half an ephah-bath.

The following table gives the values of the more important Biblical measures of capacity, on the new basis (bath = 42·5 litres); the values suggested by the present writer in the article 'Weights and Measures' in Hastings' *DB.* iv. 912 are added for comparison.

	Values in *DB.* iv.		New Values.	
	Litres.	Pints.	Litres.	Pints.
Log . . .	·56	·99	·59	1·04[1]
Kab (4 logs) .	2·25	3·96	2·36	4·16
Omer (7⅕ logs) .	4·05	7·13	4·25	7·48
Hin (12 logs) .	6·75	11·88	7·1	12·47
Seah (24 logs) .	13·5	23·76	14·17	24·94
Ephah } Bath } (72 logs) .	40·5	71·28	42·5	74·83
Homer } Cor } (720 logs)	405	712·8	425	748·3

It should be said, before leaving this part of our subject, that the values in the above table are not decisive for the values of the measures in earlier times, when they were not quite so large as they afterwards became. Thus, in an interesting passage in the Mishna (*Menakhoth*, vii. 1), it is stated that '5 Jerusalem seahs are equal to 6 wilderness seahs,' *i.e.* the seahs of Mosaic times. This means that in the first century of our era, to which the new measures probably belong, the Jerusalem measures were ⅕, or 20 per cent. larger than the earlier measures, say, of the days of the monarchy. It is probably the older and smaller value that Josephus has in mind when he states (*Ant.* III. xv. 3, as amended by Hultsch) that 30 seahs of wheat were equal to 41 modii (the modius = *circa* 15⅝ pints), for this seah of about 21 pints, when increased by a fifth, is but a trifle in excess of the new value of 25 pints given in the table.

I pass now to the second set of measures discovered by the Assumptionist Fathers. Some four or five years ago, when clearing out the ruins of the Church of St. Peter on the western hill, they came upon a small circular chamber cut in the rock, in which the mill of a private house had been installed. Of this mill an interesting description is given by the reverend Father in his lecture. In an adjoining chamber, and elsewhere in the vicinity, was found a set of eleven small stone measures, which turned out to be in definite proportional relations to each other, and all in a similar relation to the dry measure known originally as the omer, and later as the issaron, or 'tenth part' of the ephah (Ex 16[36]). An omer per head, it will be remembered, was the quantity of manna allowed to be gathered daily in the wilderness (Ex 16[16ff.]).

These eleven measures have been, wrongly as I believe, described by Père Germer-Durand as ranging from one-sixth of an omer to 8 omers, owing to his mistaken identification of measure A with the ephah-bath, as explained above. One result of this supposed equivalence, to which he himself calls attention, is the absence of the omer measure itself, the one measure we should expect to find in such a set. In reality the measures in question represent just one-half of the denominations proposed in the lecture, as was the case with the liquid measures previously discussed. Indicating the various measures, from the smallest upwards, by italics we get the following results. First, a set of fractional parts of the omer—the

[1] This value of the log is very near the latest valuation of the Attic xestes as given by Flinders Petrie in his article 'Weights and Measures' in the *Encycl. Brit.*[11], viz. 35 cubic inches, say 1·01 pint (a pint contains 34·659 cubic inches).

value of which, as entered in the above table, was approximately half a peck—viz. (*a*) $\frac{1}{12}$, (*b*) $\frac{1}{6}$, (*c*) $\frac{1}{4}$, (*d*) $\frac{2}{3}$, (*e*) $\frac{3}{4}$, and (*f*) $\frac{5}{6}$ of an omer. Then (*g*) the measure which I identify as the omer measure itself, valued by the lecturer as 2 omers; further (*h*) $1\frac{2}{3}$ omer, which is half a seah, also called a trikab (*i.e.* 3 kabs, τρίκαβος, תרקב) in the Talmud, otherwise the dry measure equivalent to the hin for liquids (12 logs); and finally (*i*) 2 omers, (*k*) $2\frac{1}{2}$ omers, the quarter ephah, and (*l*) 4 omers.

The Assumptionist Father is probably right in his suggestion that these vessels were used for measuring out the tithes of the flour and other meal ground in the domestic mill. If this suggestion is followed out, it will be found that the smaller measures, at least, are all a tenth part of familiar larger measures. Thus the three smallest measures, *a*, *b*, *c*, represent the tithe of $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{3}{4}$ seah; the next highest denomination, $\frac{1}{3}$ omer, the tithe of a whole seah, is not represented in the set, but *d*, *e*, and *f* are the tithes of 2, $2\frac{1}{4}$, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ seahs respectively.

It is to be hoped that other specimens of all the measures discussed in this essay, and of others not represented, will soon to be found. Only when a sufficient number of specimens of ancient weights and measures are available to permit of an average being struck can reliable and definite results be obtained.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF 1 CORINTHIANS.

1 Corinthians vi. 19, 20.

Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price.—R.V.

The best exposition of the text is the simplest. Take the Apostle's own phrases separately. But we must change their order; for it is because we were bought with a price that we are not our own.

I.

'Ye were bought with a price.'

The words 'Ye were bought with a price' occur twice in this Epistle. The connexion in the two passages is somewhat different, but the leading idea is the same in both. We have a Master, an Owner, who has a paramount, absolute, inalienable property in us. We are His slaves, His chattels, His implements. All other rights over us are renounced, are absorbed, are annulled in His rights. He has acquired us by virtue of purchase. In the first passage, the present text, St. Paul says, 'Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price.' In the second (1 Co 7^{23}) he says, 'Ye were bought with a price; become not bondservants of men.' Not slaves to self, not slaves to men—this is the twofold lesson which we gather from the passages considered side by side. The ownership of self is done away. The lordship of our fellow-men is no more. One slavery alone remains, the most abject, most absolute, of all slaveries. We are the slaves of Christ.

1. *Ye were bought.*

(1) If God bought man, it shows that He *values man.* Is there anything else that God bought besides man? You say, 'The cattle upon a thousand hills,' do they not belong to God? And all the gold and all the silver, are not these all His? Yes; they are His. Not only the cattle, but the hills on which they graze, and all the trees which beautify the hills are His too. And not only the metal, but the broad earth out of which it is dug is His property. 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.' He made all these. But it is not said that He bought them. He made man too. But man unmade himself, effaced the image of God, wiped out the beautiful, the Divine, and sold himself into the slavery of sin. Then, when there was no eye to pity and no arm to save, He came to help, and bought man by the gift of Jesus Christ, thus showing to us for ever how much He valued man.

(2) If God bought man, it shows that He *wants man.* We seldom buy things we do not want. There may be times when a man may try to make a tradesman believe he does not want a certain article for which he is driving a hard bargain; but that is only to beat down the price. In our daily life we but seldom buy what we do not want. God wants man, longs for him, seeks him, strives with

him, and He has bought him by the blood of His Son, thus proving that He wants him.

2. *With a price.*

(1) How can we explain this? Not the pen of the most ready writer, nor the tongue of seraph, nor the voice of sweetest angelic singer is sufficient to describe all the depth of the price which God paid for our redemption.

There was an epidemic raging in one of the towns of France. It baffled all the skill of the medical men. They had a consultation, and came to the conclusion that the only way to arrest its progress was that some one should perform a post-mortem examination upon the body of one of the victims. But whoever undertook this task would pay for his hardihood with his life. Who would volunteer? That was the question, and for a time it remained unanswered. At length a man came forward; he put all his affairs straight, performed the operation, wrote down his observations, put the paper into prepared spirit, and died. Who can say what that man paid for the welfare of others? Who can describe the price?[1]

(2) The Cross is the supreme manifestation of God's love. The greatness of the love is measured by the greatness of the price paid; and the greatness of the price paid defies all words and transcends all thought. When we try to realize it we are overwhelmed with the mystery, and we veil our faces in awe. We summon to our aid such human analogies as experience suggests or as history and fable record. The devotion of the friend risking his life to save another life as dear to him as his own; the bravery of the captain and the crew sinking calmly and resolutely into their watery grave, without a shudder, without a regret, disdaining to survive while one weak woman or one feeble child is left in peril; the heroism of the patriot hostage condemning himself to a certain and cruel death rather than forfeit his honour on the one hand, or consent to terms disastrous to his country's welfare on the other—all these have the highest value as examples of human courage and self-devotion. But how little, after all, does any such sacrifice help us to realize the magnitude of the Great Sacrifice. The analogy fails just there, where we look for its aid. It is the infinity of the price paid for our redemption that is its essential characteristic. It is the fact that God gave not a life like our lives, not a weak, erring, sin-stricken, sorrow-laden victim like ourselves, but gave His only-begotten Son, gave His Eternal Word, to become flesh, to work and to suffer, to live and to die, for our sakes. It is the fact that the Glory of the Invisible God condescended to visit this earth, to hunger and thirst, to be despised, to be buffeted, to be racked and mangled on the Cross. The sacrifice is unique, because the Person is unique. Herein was love, not that we loved Him—did we not spurn Him, did we not hate Him, did we not defy Him?—but that He loved us.

[1] C. Leach.

'The cost of a thing,' says he, 'is *the amount of what I will call life* which is required to be exchanged for it, immediately or in the long run.'[2]

II.

'Ye are not your own.'

This is an amazing statement. Or rather the fact which the Apostle Paul suddenly thrusts before the Corinthians is an amazing fact. He does not try to prove it. In pursuance of the practical argument in which he is engaged he turns round all at once and asks those to whom he is addressing himself: Or do you not know that ye are not your own? He appeals straight to their own consciousness, to that in them which is deepest. It is quite possible that they had never before thought of not being their own; on the contrary, like most other human beings, they had simply taken for granted that they were their own; and here comes St. Paul with a sort of spiritual electrical searchlight, and all at once out of the black darkness there comes forth this really awful truth: *I am not my own.*

1. What do we mean by *ownership*? As a rule, three things are more or less consciously and distinctly implied in the word. It implies, first of all, the right to *exclusive possession*; second, the right to *exclusive enjoyment or use*; and third, the right to *do as one likes* with one's property. But a moment's reflexion is sufficient to show us that we are not 'our own' in any of these senses.

(1) *We can lay no claim to absolute possession.*—If we had created ourselves we should belong to ourselves, but we are not self-created. Is it not as though a man were to go into a carpenter's or ironworker's or some other workshop and, taking the material found there, were to make out of it some article and then claim it as entirely his own? What would the owner of the timber or iron or other material say to him? Would he not say,

[2] R. L. Stevenson, *Familiar Studies of Men and Books.*

'My good sir, do not forget that the material you have worked up is mine; the labour you have expended on it may be yours, but that constitutes only a part—perhaps a small part—of the value of the article you have produced'?

(2) *Nor can we lay any claim to the exclusive enjoyment or use of ourselves.*—We dare not become slaves of self. All the ages since Christ have been charged with an undefined but overmastering sense of obligation, a sense of something, not for self, that we must do. This not only urged Paul and Augustine and Xavier to laborious missions; it not only strengthened Hus and Latimer to die; it not only inspired Wyclif and Luther and Knox to tireless efforts for religious reformation;—it was essentially this same spirit that kept Caxton to his tools, till he had wrought out his idea into a printing press; it was this that kept Columbus worrying the Spanish court till he could get the ships to penetrate those mists which shut the old world in. It was this undefined but overmastering compulsion that set Milton writing *Paradise Lost*, though he might never get five pounds for it; it was this that forced John Hampden to refuse to pay 'ship-money,' though it would have been cheaper for him to have paid it ten times over than to have involved himself in that lifelong struggle with the Stuarts. It was this that took the Pilgrim Fathers to that bleak, wintry shore where they felt they must try to found a new and freer England; this that, when the first stern winter had killed off half their number, still kept the survivors true, so that no one of them would accept the offer to return; this that throughout these later generations has nerved the patriots and reformers who have brought the world to what is best to-day.

(3) *We cannot do as we like with ourselves.*—In the physical sphere we are limited. We can determine our own actions, but we cannot determine their results. We are in the grip of laws that nothing can resist. In the social sphere we are limited. Crusoe-like, we may regard ourselves as on a desert island, and say, 'I am my own; I can do as I like.' But that is manifestly limited by the complex social order of this twentieth century. 'I own you, or a good part of you,' says Society; 'my opinions and my customs enclose and dominate you.' This social order puts our prosperity, our comfort, our very life in the hands of others to no small degree. In the moral sphere we are limited. A young man in a bank says he can, if he choose, being in charge of the books, make false entries and embezzle money; but, so acting, he, as belonging to a certain civil order, is bound hand and foot to certain inevitable penal consequences. So our whole life is set in and belongs to a Divine moral order, more real and potent than any civil order. I can tell a lie if I like, or use foul language if I choose, but I cannot keep that foul language from defiling my nature and my soul, or that lie from deceiving my own spirit. I am my own. I can, if I like, be hard, selfish, covetous; but I cannot help that lust for gold narrowing my own life and my own soul. We are not our own. We belong to a Divine moral order, irresistible. But over and above this, above the physical and social and moral orders that hold and limit us, we belong to a great redemptive order. We are not our own, because we have been 'bought with a price.'

2. Having, then, been bought by Christ, we belong to Christ. And we belong to Christ wholly. Body, soul, spirit—we are altogether His.

(1) *Our wills are Christ's.*—He counts us His to do His will with. Imagine a soldier about to join an army on a campaign saying to himself, 'I shall always sleep on a soft bed. I shall never have to trudge till I am weary; my life must not be exposed to danger: but I shall have comfort, and shelter, and pleasure, and the prizes, and the rewards, and the honour, and dignity, and applause, when we come home again victorious.' What a surprise he would get to find his real position! A soldier! why the very essence of the thing means that he has no will of his own at all; that his very judgment is put away from him. He is never to choose or plan, but simply to go where he is bidden, to do what he is told, to face shot and shell, to think nothing of his life, to endure hardships, to fight till he is like to drop with fatigue, to go on the forlorn hope to certain death, that the army of which he is a part may march on to victory.

As for what passes in me at present, I cannot express it. I have no pain nor any doubt as to my state, because I have no will but that of God, which I endeavour to carry out in all things, and to which I am so submissive that I would not take up a straw from the ground against His order, or from any other motive but purely that of love to Him.[1]

[1] Brother Lawrence, *The Practice of the Presence of God*, 45.

O Lord, fulfil Thy Will,
Be the days few or many, good or ill:
Prolong them, to suffice
For offering up ourselves Thy sacrifice;
Shorten them if Thou wilt,
To make in righteousness an end of guilt.
Yea, they will not be long
To souls who learn to sing a patient song;
Yea, short they will not be
To souls on tiptoe to flee home to Thee.
O Lord, fulfil Thy Will:
Make Thy Will ours, and keep us patient still,
Be the days few or many, good or ill.[1]

(2) *Our activities are Christ's.*—The slave-owner could command the entire energies of the purchased possession, night and day, and in any form that he wished. Just as an Eastern Sultan to-day can make of one subject a vizier and of another a menial drudge, so our Lord can allot to us either lowly toil or lofty honour. And, rightly considered, the lowliest toil is lofty honour if done to Him. All time, ability, influence have been purchased by Him in His death for our redemption, and from henceforth it is ours to ask, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

One of our missionaries in India once had a letter addressed to him by a heathen priest, thus: 'To John Wilson, servant of the Messiah.'[2]

When slavery existed in America it often used to be said, and said truly, that a slave could not earn anything for himself; what his labour produced was never his own. Had he had the artistic genius of a Raphael or a Michael Angelo or a Beethoven; had he been a poet like Dante or Shakespeare; had he been a scientist like Newton or Darwin; could he have sung or played with the most celebrated; had he been an inventor like Edison—all in vain; not a single fruit of his genius or work could he claim as his property, for the simple reason that he himself belonged to his master. That master might give him a part of what he produced; but it was a gift, not primarily property.[3]

(3) *Our possessions are Christ's.*—The poor belongings of the slave—his hut, his meagre furniture, his little patch of garden—were not his own. He was not his owner, but his owner's. So in beneficent despotism, nothing that I possess is mine if I am Christ's; it is entrusted to me, to use for Him. Life, health, opportunity, genius, influence, money—all are to bear the broad arrow of royal possession, and in bearing it find their greatest praise and glory.

3. Being slaves of Christ, we are free and attain to *self-possession.* To be owned by a man is to be a slave; to be owned by God is to be a free man,—free in the fullest sense of that word. We are the sworn soldiers, the very bond slaves, of a perfect Lord. Our lives and every possibility that our lives contain belong absolutely to another, whose service is the only reality of our own freedom, or our own perfection.

In the old days, before Abraham Lincoln's slave emancipation, there was put up in the slave auction in New Orleans a beautiful mulatto girl. The bids rose from 500 dollars to 700, then a voice outside the crowd called 750 dollars. Higher and higher the bids went, until, at 1450 dollars, the stranger got the girl. He turned out to be a Northerner, and she hated the thought of becoming his slave. The next morning he called at the house where she was. She said sadly, 'Sir, I am ready to go with you.' 'But I do not want you to go with me. Look over this,' handing her the paper of her freedom. 'I bought you that you might be free.' She exclaimed, 'You bought me that I might be free? Am I free? Free? Can I do as I like with myself?' He answered, 'Yes, you are free.' Then she said, with sobs of joy, 'Oh, sir, I will go with you and be your servant for ever.'[4]

[1] Christina G. Rossetti, *Poems*, 140.
[2] H. O. Mackay.
[3] D. W. Simon.
[4] F. B. Cowl.

Sargon of Assyria in the Lake Region of Van and Urmia, 714 B.C.

By Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., London.

Sargon the Later came to the throne of Assyria 722 years before Christ, and enjoyed what might be called a glorious reign of 16 years' duration. During the period which preceded his 8th year he had overthrown the Elamites at Dêr, defeated Hanon of Gaza and Sib'e the field marshal of Muṣuru at Raphia, forcing Pir'u of Muṣuru to pay tribute. He had also crushed Yau-bi'idi the Hamathite. These successes had apparently secured to the Assyrians their suzerainty of the

Mediterranean coast-lands, and left them free to adopt measures which they regarded as needful for their security elsewhere. In 719 B.C., therefore, Sargon turned his attention to the region N.E. of Assyria, the Manneans and the Araratites, the result of the operations in the latter district being the transport of at least a part of the population to 'Heth of the Amorites.' The operations in 718 were against Kiakki of Sinuḫtu, a city in Tubal.

Thinking his victories on this side had made him secure, Sargon turned his attention again to the west in the year 717 B.C., on account of the intrigues of Pîsîri of Carchemish, whose dominions seem to have been practically annexed. Eastern affairs, however, again became menacing, and Sargon had to act against the Papites and the Lalluknites, who planned treacherously against the land of Kakmē. About this time the Manneans refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Assyria, and Bagdatti of Uišdiš, supported by Mitatti of Zikirtu, was also hostile. Ullusunu of Mannu took sides against Assyria, and attracted the attention of Sargon by making peace with his nearest foe. Ursā of Ararat, to whom he handed 22 towns, not altogether (as Sargon indicates) by his own free will. Sargon's expedition in this district resulted in the flight of Mitatti of Zikirtu, the defeat of Bagdatti of Uišdiš, and the deportation of the Mannean chief Dayaukku (Dejoices) to Hamath. Ullusunu fled to the mountains, but, deciding that submission was the best policy, came down and made homage. These latter events took place in 715 B.C., and it is at this point that the new inscription comes in.

'To Aššur, father of the gods, the great lord dwelling in Ê-ḫursag-gal-kurkura, his great temple, greatly, greatly, may there be salutation.

'To the gods of the fates and the goddesses dwelling in Ê-ḫursag-gal-kurkura, their great temple, greatly, greatly, may there be salutation.

'To the gods of the fates and the goddesses dwelling in the city Aššur, their great temple, greatly, greatly, may there be salutation.

'To the city and its people may there be salutation. To the palace situated within it, may there be salutation.

'For Sargon, the holy priest, the servant fearing thy great divinity, and for his camp, much, much (is) the well-being.'

Such is the beginning of the noteworthy inscription which came to the knowledge of the authorities of the Oriental Department of the Louvre last year, and which, at the able hands of M. Fr. Thureau-Dangin, has attained the honour of publication, and at once ranged itself among the great historical records of the world. The original is a tablet of baked clay in the usual Assyrian style, 37·5 cms. high by 24·5 cms. wide, and it bears, in two columns on each side, no less than 430 rather long lines of writing. Unfortunately, the ends of the columns on the obverse and the beginnings of those on the reverse are rendered incomplete on account of fractures. Including the five lines of the salutation and the colophon the inscription is divided into 21 paragraphs by ruled lines made by a straightedge. Two similar ruled lines divide the columns from each other, and have, between them, the usual little holes supposed to be for the escape of steam whilst the tablet was baking, but which may have been for the insertion of tiny pegs to enable the heavy document to be laid down on its side, during the writing, without damaging the clearness of the script. Every tenth line is marked by the numeral '10.'

The text proper begins in line 6, after the salutation, and states that Sargon started from Calah, his royal city, in the month Tammuz:—

'The month which fixeth the counsels of nations, the month of the mighty one, the firstborn of Enlil —the mighty one of the gods, Anušat.'[1]

The lord of knowledge, Nin-igi-azaga (Ea), had caused this month to be inscribed on the tablets of old time for the assembling of the army and the formation of camps.

Setting out, Sargon crossed the upper Zab at its flood, and halted on the third day to humble himself before Enlil and Ninlil, seemingly because he did not wish the envious to point to him as one who did not worship the gods. He then crossed 'the difficult ford' of the lower Zab as though it had been a mere watercourse, and found himself in the passes of Kullar, the mountainous region of Lullumu or Zamua (possibly the route Altunkeupri to Soleimanieh). Just here was the land of Sumbu—probably the fertile plains of Shehrizor —where he held a review of his army, and noted the number of his horses and chariots.

Having seen that all was in order, he entered the region of the mountains, and passed through

[1] The reading proposed by Pognon for the characters *Nin-ip*.

Zikirtu[1] and Andia. On one side he had mount Nikippa and on the other mount Upā, lofty peaks all covered with trees, overshadowed everywhere like a cedar-forest, in which the wayfarer could not see the light of the sun. Here he found a water-course, the Būia, which he and his army crossed no less than 26 times. In striking language he describes the lance-like mount Simirria, dominating the wooded heights, wherein dwelt Bêlit-îlē, 'the lady of the gods.'

'On high its head upholds the heavens, below its foundations reach the centre of Hades; and like the spinal joint of a fish, it has no passage from side to side.'

The mere sight of its precipitous sides inspired fear.

This tract being unsuited for the passage of chariots and horses, and difficult even for cavalry, his pioneers cut a way through with their strong brazen axes. Chariots, cavalry, and infantry, however, he 'caused to fly over it (the mountain) like valiant eagles:' and 'the camels and pack-asses bounded upon its peak like goats raised in the mountains.' Other mountains which Sargon crossed were the Sinaḫulzi and the Biruatti, lofty heights whose verdure was *karšu*-herb (? moss) and sweet-smelling *ṣumlulū*. Seven peaks were crossed at this point, and two rivers, the Rappā and the Arattā. M. Fr. Thureau-Dangin regards the route as being that from Soleimanieh to Sakiz, by the pass to Báneh.

Here he entered the Mannean province of Surikaš, probably the region watered by the Jaghatú. Ullusunu, its king, came out to meet him with a great train of notables, 'in gladness of heart and joy of face,' because Sargon had supported him in his struggles with his enemies, and he wished the help to continue. To greet his benefactor, therefore, Ullusunu had journeyed from Izirtu, his capital, and met Sargon at the frontier of his land. The tribute which he brought for the Assyrian king consisted of draught-horses with their harness, oxen, and small cattle—a welcome gift for his suzerain.

Having received Ullusunu's homage, Sargon resumed his march, his objective being Latašē on the river Lāruate in Allabria, conjectured by M. Thureau-Dangin to be in the upper valley of the Tatava. The ruler of this district, who bore the Assyro-Babylonian name of Bêl-abla-iddina, paid tribute similar to that of Ullusunu, and was left in peace. The next tract invaded was Parsuaš, S.W. of lake Urmia (Sayce), and the rulers of Namru, Sangibutu, Bît-Abdadani, and the 'powerful Medes,' hearing of his coming, sent to him valuable tribute. The states who thus bought the invader off were 27 in number, and though of little or no importance politically, they are not without historical and geographical interest.

Invading next the Mannean province of Missu, which also lay near the lake, Sargon was met by the faithful Ullusunu at his fortress Sirdakka[2] with supplies of flour and wine for his army, and a further tribute of horses and cattle. The Mannean king also entrusted to Sargon his eldest son, who likewise brought gifts. The reason of this obsequiousness on the part of Ullusunu was, that he wished to be assured against the invasions of the Kakmeans and see Ursā of Ararat crushed. The homage which the Manneans made was therefore of the humblest kind, and, apparently feeling pity for the vassal lying prone before him, Sargon answered 'Ahulap,' a word apparently meaning 'in the end'—that is: 'All being well, I will do as you wish.' The promise which he afterwards made was that he would overthrow Ararat and make the boundaries of Mannu as they were of old. Having reared a magnificent (sacrificial) table, Sargon gave Ullusunu a seat thereat higher than that of his dead father Ir-anzu, to the further gratification of Ullusunu and his people.

Zīzī of Appatar and Zalāa the Kitpatian, two Gizilbundian city-chiefs, were the next to be approached. The province which they ruled is described as being shut in 'like a bolt' between the Manneans' land and the Medes. Tribute of horses, oxen, and sheep having been received, the province was annexed, and placed under the governor of Parsuaš; and the road of conquest was continued.

Starting from Zirdiakka, which is apparently the Sirdakka already mentioned, the Assyrian army marched 30 leagues into Mannean territory, Bît-Kabsi, and Media. This brought them to Panziš, a stronghold strategically situated to restrain the inroads of the two latter nationalities. Having strengthened the defensive works and provisioned the place, Sargon crossed the river Ištaraurā—probably the Karangú—and entered Aukanē. This movement was undertaken in order to attack

[1] Also written Zigirtu.

[2] Zirdiakka in lines 71 and 74, lower down.

Metatti, the Zikirtite, who, trusting to Ursā of Ararat, withheld his submission. Ursā, however, was not there to protect him, so that he was compelled to seek safety in flight. The Zikirtite ruler chose mount Uašdirikka as his refuge, and his subjects scattered themselves on other distant mountain peaks, where Sargon was unable to find them. Metatti evidently did not feel himself strong enough to resist the Assyrian king, so, despairing of retaining his capital, Parda, he left all his palace property as spoil to the conqueror, and went forth with his retainers to the help of Ursā. Twelve fortified cities and 84 villages were captured by the Assyrians, and, after destroying their fortifications, they were left mere heaps of ruins.

Next came the turn of the Mannean province of Uišdiš—possibly W. of the Sahend, 'and certainly in that district.' This had been annexed by Ursā of Ararat, and it was evidently Sargon's intention to restore it to his vassal Ullusunu. After venting his wrath on the Araratian king in forceful language, Sargon describes the difficulties of the district and the rigours of the climate of the place wherein Ursā had taken refuge with his trained warriors and active cavalry. At this point the record is mutilated, and the sense therefore not clear, but it would seem that Metatti the Zikirtian had carefully posted his forces in a ravine, where, in spite of the advantages of the ground, Sargon's troops succeeded in defeating him, notwithstanding that the Assyrian forces were tired, hungry, and had not time to make any defensive works—moreover, the action seemingly took place whilst the main body was at a distance. From the Assyrian king's account, it was a bloody fight—the corpses of the foe covered the slopes of the mountains, and their blood dyed the plain, slopes, and heights like a carpet.

Nevertheless, Metatti was able to join forces with Ursā of Ararat. It does not seem, however, as though Metatti's help availed much, for they were both routed in the defiles of mount Uauš, which M. Thureau-Dangin identifies with the Sahend. Passing the description of the slaughter which took place, it would seem that Sargon pursued them from the Uauš to Zimur, 'the mountain of jasper,' where those who had fled to save their lives were driven on again by Hadad, who 'threw down his great voice upon them, and in clouds of downpours and the stone of heaven completed the rest.' Ursā fled in fear like a cave-bird (owl) before the eagle, and abandoned Ṭurušpā, his capital, like a murderer. Having gained the mountain-side, he threw himself down on his bed like a woman in travail, and, refusing food and drink, inflicted upon himself an incurable malady. This victory secured rest for the Manneans from the depredations of the Araratians and their allies, at least for a time; and whilst the inhabitants of the district gave vent to cries and lamantation, Sargon returned to his camp 'in joy of heart and gladness, with singers, harps, and tambourines.'

After sacrifices to Nergal, Hadad, and Ištar, and services of praise, Sargon quitted Uišdiš, and marched to Ušqaia, a stronghold which is described as the 'head of the boundary' of Ararat, at the entry into Zaranda. Ušqaia probably lay, Thureau-Dangin notes, in the Tabriz region, and Zaranda, a province which was as a bolted door and kept back his messengers, apparently lay to the east. Here his eyes were attracted by Mallāu, a mountain covered wtih cypress—it looked like a boundary-mark dominating the country of Sûbu, possibly the region between Sakiz and Tabriz. Of this tract he says :—

'The people dwelling in this region have not their equal in all Ararat in their power (to train) riding-horses.'

'The foals of the young stallions produced in his (Ursā's) vast country, which they rear for his royal army, he takes every year—

'As long as they have not been taken to the province of Sûbu (which the people of Ararat call the land of the Manneans), and their capability is not seen,

'They are not mounted, and advancing, retreating, and turning, the requirements of battle array are not shown. Harness is dispensed with.'

Certain letters from Nineveh speak of the horses obtained by the Assyrians from Andia and Zikirtu, the provinces from which Sargon turned aside on this occasion to conquer Uišdiš, showing that the Assyrians carried their admiration for Araratian and Mannean horses to the extent of acquiring them for their cavalry and chariots.

(*To be concluded.*)

In the Study.

New Sermon Literature.

The Heart of a Child.

The Rev. J. Warschauer, M.A., D.Phil., has preached a course of sermons on the Book of Proverbs, and published it under the name of *The Way of Understanding* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). The title of one of the sermons is 'The Heart of a Child,' and that is also the text. The words are taken from Pr 22^{15}.

Dr. Warschauer begins by pointing out how small a difference the lapse of twenty-five centuries or so has made in the essentials of human nature. 'The same motives sway us, the same frailties beset us, the same trials vex us, as beset and swayed these Orientals of a bygone age; and the line which tells us that

East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,

is seen to be little more than a high-sounding superficiality after all.'

But in one respect there is a diametrical difference between the outlook of these ancient sages and our own, that is in the treatment of children. The Book of Proverbs breathes a fervent belief in the wholesomeness of drastic measures with children. 'Children are naturally stupid and perverse, and the nonsense has to be knocked out of them—for their own good, no doubt, but also for the peace and comfort of much-tried grown-ups who have something better to do than to be bothered with unruly youngsters.'

And Dr. Warschauer has no difficulty in finding texts to prove it. Our attitude to children is quite different. Where has the change come from? It has come from Christ, says Dr. Warschauer. So that it is really a difference between the Old Testament and the New. When Christ said, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God'—we are at one bound removed to a different climate, and almost to a different world, certainly a different world for children.

It is a difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament. And the extraordinary thing is that almost up to our own day the method of the Old Testament has been preferred to the method of the New. 'How much the people of a bygone day deprived themselves of by maintaining the ceremonial usage which made a son address his father in his letters as "Honoured Sir," and close with presenting his "dutiful respects"! Mr. William Canton, one of the most delightful interpreters of childhood, relates how, when he had told his little girl of these stiff formalities, she asked him, "Didn't they say 'Daddy' sometimes? Didn't they say it on Sunday, *for a treat*?" Alas, Sunday was apt to be less of a treat day than any other in the week for the mites of those stern and gloomy days!'

1. Dr. Warschauer's subject is 'The Heart of a Child,' and his first point is that the heart of a child has to be won. Now it can be won only if it is studied and understood. 'And the first thing to understand is that the child is a separate individuality, a new creation of God, with rights to be respected, with a soul to be developed, a self that craves expression, and which it is a stupid cruelty to force into suppression. And then let us remember that a child is all imagination, all vitality, and to suppress childish mirth, childish high spirits, in the interests of "strictness," stunts, and may kill, something that is exceeding precious; as often as not, such strictness is merely another name for grown-up dulness and impatience. Do you know these lines?

In the house of "too much trouble"
Lived a lonely little boy;
He was eager for a playmate,
He was hungry for a toy.
But 'twas always "too much trouble,"
"Too much dirt," and "too much noise,"
For the house of "too much trouble"
Wasn't meant for little boys.

And sometimes the little fellow
Left a book upon the floor,
Or forgot and laughed too loudly,
Or he failed to close the door.
In the house of "too much trouble"
Things must be precise and trim—
In the house of "too much trouble"
There was little room for him.

He must never scatter playthings,
He must never romp and play;
Every room must be in order,
And kept quiet all the day.

He had never had companions,
  He had never owned a pet—
In the house of "too much trouble"
  It is trim and quiet yet.

Every room is set in order,
  Every book is in its place,
And the lonely little fellow
  Wears a smile upon his face.
In the house of "too much trouble"
  He is silent and at rest—
In the house of "too much trouble,"
  With a lily on his breast.'

2. So the first thing is Sympathy. The second is that sympathy must not be confounded with Sentimentality. 'Children are not meant to be agreeable, pretty toys, or charming live dolls for their elders; and many a future character has been spoilt in the bud by treatment which regarded the child as something purely ornamental, by a bringing-up without seriousness of purpose, a period of youth in which there was no instilling of a sense of responsibility, of duty, of self-respect—ideas which the normal child is perfectly capable of understanding and responding to. That true sympathy which inspired our Saviour's estimate of young lives—an estimate which must have amazed His hearers—is always ultimately based upon respect, upon reverence for the wonder of personality which we can never fathom.'

'There is, of course, room and necessity for correction, reproof, discipline, for it is no good to delude ourselves by seeing boys and girls through rose-coloured clouds of sentimentalism; but the only correction which avails is that which is inwardly approved by the small delinquents' own sense of justice — a sense which is apt to be remarkably strong and keen. We have smiled together ere now over the Rugby boy's outspoken comment on Dr. Temple, the Head Master: "Temple's a beast, but he's a just beast." That was evidently one of the secrets of his remarkable influence — the conviction he inspired in the many hundreds of lads who passed through his hands, that even in punishing them for their pranks and misdemeanours he was determined to act fairly, and could be trusted not to pass the bounds of what the transgressor himself would, in his heart, acknowledge to be justice.'

3. The third thing, says Dr. Warschauer, is to be firmly convinced that the soil is good, almost invariably good. He returns to Jesus. 'It is surely what Jesus indicated in the most striking manner when He pointed to a casual knot of village boys and girls—not "angelic" or æsthetic youngsters in the least—with the authoritative declaration, "Of such is the kingdom of God." I do not forget the fact of heredity, the inborn proclivities that may be waiting, unsuspected, to assert themselves in the years of growth; nevertheless, generally speaking, the possibilities of good in a child outweigh the possibilities of evil immeasurably, asking only to be recognised and utilised.'

4. 'More than this, the heart of the normal child naturally responds to every fine sentiment; it has a spontaneous appreciation of generosity, compassionateness, bravery, unselfishness; there is no difficulty in appealing to its admiration for what is really admirable, or in engaging its sympathies with any fine and chivalrous action. There lies the real hope and promise in all character training; the educator has not to start with the task of expelling a mass of evil that is native to the childish spirit, as the writers of Proverbs would have us believe, but to take for granted the child's receptiveness for whatever is good and healthy. To people the youthful mind with stories of the heroic, of loyal devotion, of high attempts and courageous enterprises, is never difficult and always worth while, and the value of *this* kind of education is happily becoming ever more fully recognised.'

5. 'But if the heart of a child possesses an intense capacity for happiness, it possesses a corresponding one for its opposite; if it is only too willing to unfold and respond to love, it is bitterly hurt by the want of it, keenly sensitive to unkindness. No greater mistake than to imagine that the sorrows of little ones are therefore little in themselves; or that because their occasions are trifling from our point of view, they are felt by them as trifles; on the contrary, this lost ball or that damaged engine are big things, filling the horizon and mattering immensely. I know of a child of four who was told by his mother how in hurrying along the street she had accidentally trodden upon and spoilt some little urchin's penny toy, and the piteous wail he set up; I remember to this day the impression made upon the child who heard the story, how all on a sudden the joy seemed to have gone out of things, how he went to bed with a heavy heart, and how for a

long time afterwards the memory of that trivial tragedy, to which he never dared allude, sufficed to give him a keen twinge of pain.'

6. Last of all, and in a single paragraph, which shall be quoted in full, Dr. Warschauer touches on the child's religion. 'What,' he asks, 'shall we say of the share of religion in the heart of a child? If we are wise, I think, we shall say little, and that little cautiously. So much is quite sure, that young hearts are naturally religious, accessible, as to all good influences, to this, the highest of all; so much also is sure, that it is futile, and worse, to introduce those tender, unformed minds to the aridities and subtleties of speculative doctrine. They have no difficulty in responding to the simple teaching of God as their Father, of Jesus as their loving Friend; no need to trouble them with a scholastic, dogmatic theology, which can only serve to cloud the vision of childhood. "What are you doing?" a mother asked her little boy of three, as he stood gazing out of the window one night; unhesitatingly the cry came back—"I am smiling at God; I can't see Him, but He can see me." "Smiling at God"—ah, if we could smile at Him, like children, trustfully and confidingly, would He not smile at us? "Out of the mouth of babes He perfecteth praise."'

Child Conversion.

It sometimes takes two sermons to exhaust a subject. The Rev. D. M. M'Intyre begins just where Dr. Warschauer leaves off. Mr. M'Intyre has published a volume of addresses under the title of *Spirit and Power* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). They seem to have been spoken partly to the pulpit and partly to the pew. And as there is no attempt to disentangle the audience the effect is sometimes startling, and the more effective it is the more it startles. One of the addresses is on 'Child Conversion.'

The note is struck at once. It is the *religion* of a child that Mr. M'Intyre is interested in. He recalls a story which 'Dr. John Duncan used to tell of an aged professor in Prague, who, as he passed up and down the streets, was accustomed to lay his hand on the head of any child whom he should meet, reverently uttering that Name which is above every other name. He could not look on a young face without yearning to impart some spiritual gift.'

But to whom is Mr. M'Intyre speaking? Probably to preachers. For, after referring to the natural affinity between Christ and a little child, he tells us what Dr. Pope, the celebrated Wesleyan theologian, used to say to his students in Didsbury, 'When you go out into your circuits, never lose an opportunity of getting down among the children, and letting Jesus Christ look at you through their eyes.'

By saying that children are near to Christ, Mr. M'Intyre does not mean that they do not need to enter into 'a saving relation to Him.' He believes firmly that they do. In proof he quotes 'two statements of Christ which are in apparent contrast, but are really complementary truths: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," and "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." Between these sentences the parable of the Seeking Shepherd and the lost sheep, with its direct application to child-life, intervenes.'

Accordingly, Mr. M'Intyre proceeds to ask, 'How soon may a child, consciously and deliberately, give in his adhesion to Christ? Surely, as soon as he is able to understand the nature of Divine love. And that may be at a very early age. On one occasion Jesus "called a little child unto him." The boy was so little, that, as one of the evangelists indicates, he climbed up into Christ's embrace, resting with infinite contentment in the kind arms of the Lord. And this little lad, one of a number just such as he, Christ claimed as a disciple, "One of these little ones that believe on me."'

He then gives this example: 'Jonathan Edwards, the grave divine of New England, has written a characteristically careful account of the revival of religion in Massachusetts and Connecticut, but in all that remarkable history nothing, perhaps, interested him more than the story of the conversion of little Phœbe Bartlet, aged four. As we know, this child lived to be an old woman of more than eighty years, and maintained her Christian hope undimmed.'

It sometimes happens that after an early conversion there is a sorrowful declension from child-piety. Richard Baxter's father used to say, with tears in his eyes, that his son was consecrated even from the cradle, but in youth Richard fell into evil practices, and had, as it were, to be reconverted. 'I

imagine that this thing often happens. But perhaps it never need happen. The reason of its occurrence lies, as it seems to me, along two lines. In the first place, there is the constant bias, strong even in a renewed nature, which carries the mind away from God. The most experienced Christian requires to keep his heart with all diligence, and the pliable mind of youth, with its swift acceptance of impressions from without and its frank expression of moods, is in still greater peril. But what is more germane to our subject is this: as the boy or girl advances in knowledge and ripens in experience, the horizon widens, new thoughts stream in, new motives are generated, new temptations emerge; in fact, the whole life reconstructs itself. It is necessary, therefore, frequently to realise one's religious acquisitions, to readjust one's religious outlook, to reconsider one's religious practice.'

Besides this, there are crises in child life. 'The fathers of the Scottish Church, unversed as they may have been in what we call "the new psychology," recognised these crises. An Act of the Church was passed, to the effect that the minister of the parish should have "catechisings"—involving, for the most part, personal religious conversation—with every child at the age of nine, eleven, and fourteen.'

And now it becomes quite clear that Mr. M'Intyre is addressing the pastor and preacher. For at this point he asks the question, How ought we to present the truths of grace to young children? What is his answer?

1. 'A child comes to Christ, as older people do, in repentance and faith. Repentance frequently reveals itself in contrition, but essentially it is the turning from sin to God. I do not think that the broad statements one occasionally meets with of the absence of keen conviction from the child-heart are true to fact. The conscience of a child is often exquisitely sensitive, although one does not expect to find in early years those agonising and tumultuous distresses which in the case of an older person sometimes shake the heart with fear. It is in the *Life of George Müller*, I think, that the story is told of a little girl, who, being examined as to her faith in Christ, was asked, "But how about the Slough of Despond?" She replied, "Please, sir, I didn't come that way." And when children do come that way, as John Bunyan observed centuries ago, they pass lightly over the stepping-stones which Graceless, in his distress, so often fails to see. But repentance is turning to God, and this is possible only when it is interlaced and interlinked with faith. In conjunction with the decision of the will, the child must trustfully repose on Christ. Only so will power be given to carry the decision into effect and consequence. A boy said to his mother once, "Mother, I've been giving my heart to the Lord Jesus, but it won't go." No. Faith must go hand-in-hand with repentance.'

2. 'To a very young child faith is wrapped up in love: within the circle of the family, love implies reliance, confidence, trust. Perhaps faith is never quite separated from affection; but, emphatically, the Christian belief of a little child is repose in the love of a gracious Saviour. A friend of mine, some years ago, was conducting a series of meetings for young people in Greenock. At the close of one of the services, a girl lingered in the aisle, shyly, as if she were desirous to speak to him. He noticed her, and said, "Well, my dear, what is it that you have to say to me?" "Please, sir," she replied, "He hath persuaded and enabled me to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to me in the Gospel." That is faith, according to the definition of a group of theological experts, it is faith according to the experience of a little child. It is to a personal Christ, a Christ who loves and saves, that the child-heart goes out.'

Three more of the volumes which go by the name of 'The Short Course Series' have been published (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net each). First there is a study in the visions of Zechariah by the editor of the series, the Rev. John Adams, B.D. Its title is *The Man among the Myrtles*.

Next there is *The Sevenfold I Am*, by the Rev. Thomas Marjoribanks, B.D. Evelyn Underhill in her new book on *The Mystic Way* speaks of the solemn 'I am' of the Johannine Christ, and calls it 'the dramatic expression of the mystic's certainty.' Mr. Marjoribanks does not write as a mystic or for mystics. In accordance with the purpose of the series he writes as an expositor for preachers.

Thirdly, there is a volume by the Rev. Thomas Whitelaw, D.D., on the names in the Old Testament compounded with Jehovah, as Jehovah-Jîreh. The title he has given his book is *Jehovah-Jesus*.

'Five sermons preached by five bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church presiding at as many

annual conferences of the Southwest Kansas Conference,' have been published in a single volume, entitled *The Humiliation of Christ* (Eaton & Mains; 50 c. net). The Humiliation of Christ is the title of the first sermon. It is a simple, and in its simplicity most striking, account of how truly Christ was born 'under the law.' The author is Bishop Henry W. Warren. This sermon is appropriately succeeded by one on 'the Making of Jesus Christ.' Under this title Bishop Nuelsen describes the process by which the Church grew out of the humiliation. The making of Jesus is the building of Christ's Church, just as the Acts of the Apostles are the things which Jesus did after He ascended. The sermons are all marked by individuality, evidently the work of strong men; yet all agree in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Messrs. Eaton & Mains have issued a volume of sermons by the Rev. Alpheus B. Austin, D.D., entitled *Linked Lives* ($1 net). They are remarkable sermons. They seem to combine the best features of British and American sermons into one, and are therefore truly after the mind of the universal Christ. There is an absence of provincialism even in their language. Only an occasional spelling betrays the country of their birth. And their topics are fresh. Especially notable are the sermons on 'Factors in Moral Victories' and on 'The Consecration of our Utmost.' The text of the latter is 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.'

Under the title of *The Mind of Christ*, the Rev. A. D. Batchelor, A.M., S.T.B., has published an exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eaton & Mains; 50 c. net). It is such an exposition as may be given in addresses at a prayer meeting. And the author is able to show that such careful exposition and not too much of it at the time, together with sincere modern instances, is able to arrest the attention and increase the attendance at prayer meetings.

Mr. A. H. Tuttle, taking the narrative as we have it, in spite of Colenso and all his kind, has lectured on the Journey of the Israelites through the Wilderness homiletically, and has published his lectures with the title *Egypt to Canaan* (Eaton & Mains; $1.00 net). There is fine homiletical material in the record of that memorable journey, and perhaps our preachers have been unduly afraid of Colenso. This volume has the usual lessons to teach, but it teaches them with unusual force and freshness, by using the incidents of the march as illustration. And truly the themes, however familiar, are great—the Passover, the Manna, the Decalogue, the Tabernacle, and the Death of Moses. Let us add that the book is printed and bound with a fine appreciation of the importance to a book of printing and binding. The book-lover should be considered as well as the book reader.

The work of the Son of God, says Mr. Philip Mauro, is threefold. It is past, as the Apostle of God; it is present, as High Priest in the heavenly Sanctuary, fulfilling the type of the great day of Atonement; and it is future, as King-Priest of the age to come. On these three topics Mr. Mauro is wont to deliver addresses here and there which are eagerly listened to. Now he has written out the addresses and issued them in a volume under the title, *God's Apostle and High Priest* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net).

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have issued in their 'Golden Treasury' series *The Gift and the Life*, two series of addresses by Theodore Monod, and a new impression of *Foundation Truths of the Gospel* (1s. net each). The latter, it will be remembered, contains a series of papers on the Fall, Sin, the Atonement, and other great doctrines, by recognized evangelical teachers, such as Canon Girdlestone, Mr. Meyer, Mr. M'Intyre, and Bishop Moule.

Another course of lectures has been established. It is called 'The James Sprunt Lectureship.' It is attached to Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. The lectures are to be delivered 'on subjects connected with various departments of Christian Thought and Christian Work.' The first course has been delivered by the Rev. David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York. The subject is *The Sermon, its Construction and Delivery* (Revell; 5s. net).

The subject is limited and the book is large. Dr. Burrell has space to handle it thoroughly. And he does handle it thoroughly. There is a

seriousness of spirit and an entrance into detail that of themselves make an impression. And then it is manifest that the author, who thus magnifies his office, has had sufficient experience to know when to warn and when to encourage. No apology is offered for treating the sermon as a thing to be constructed with plan and purpose. Evidently Dr. Burrell has no regard for the man who imagines that he can spin a sermon out of his own unaided brains. Every effort is needed to gather materials, every effort to lay a good foundation in the facts of life, every effort to add point to point of the argument, every effort to carry reason, imagination, feeling, conscience, and will in the final appeal. But perhaps Dr. Burrell is at his best and most earnest when he urges the use of illustrations. He even suggests a variety of sources for them—the Bible, the Parish Round, Travel, History and Biography, Mythology, Science, Art, Personal Experience. For he knows that the indolent preacher betrays his indolence at once by his lack of illustrations.

In the *Sunday School Times* of Philadelphia there has been appearing for some time a series of devotional studies in Genesis, their author being the editor himself, Mr. Charles Gallaudet Trumbull. These studies are now issued in book-form with the title *Messages for the Morning Watch* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). 'No one,' says Mr. Trumbull, 'who has not tested it for himself can know the enrichment of spending time in the early morning, before entering upon the day's work or even breaking one's fast, alone with God in prayer and in the devotional reading of His Word. This habit of keeping the Morning Watch, as it is called, is undoubtedly being used of God for the complete making over of many lives that have already been committed into the keeping of His Son.'

The notes are short, usually expressing a single thought. That thought is always worthy and sometimes striking.

A small volume of short sermons is *Fruits of the Spirit*, by the Rev. John H. Bedford (Stockwell; 1s. net). The sermons seem to be published for the use of the preacher; and they do contain much pointed suggestion. But why are so many of the paragraphs no longer than a single sentence?

'I have been studying somewhat of late this word "compassion." It is one of the deepest and most significant words we find in all the Gospels. It is used by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. It is used of four persons—the Good Samaritan; the master of the debtor; the father of the prodigal; and it is used of Jesus. It is used of Jesus on four occasions. It is used of Him in connexion with the leper; it is used of Him in connexion with the blind man; it is used of Him in connexion with the Widow of Nain; it is used of Him in connexion with the multitude. It is used of Jesus in connexion with the multitude three times, when He saw the multitude sick; when He saw the multitude tired and weary; when He saw the multitude hungry and faint. It is one of the strongest words in all our language—literally it means "to move toward with an outstretched hand." It is therefore a stronger word than love, because it is love in action, love expressing itself in service.'

This is merely an occasional aside in one of Dr. Len G. Broughton's sermons in a volume entitled *The Prodigal and Others* (Meyer; 2s. 6d. net). There are many such asides in the book. For the force of Mr. Broughton's preaching is not in arguments, but in unexpectedness.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Mr. Allenson has published a small volume of children's addresses by the Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A. Its title is, *What I said to the Children* (1s. net). The addresses are very short and very easily remembered. Here is one of them.

Where does your Heart live?

Where do you keep your heart? In my breast, you answer. Of course it is, but I am thinking of your heart in another sense. Your heart is what you love with, just as your mind is what you think with. Your heart is the most important part of you because your loves are the most important part of your life. So I say again, Where does your heart stay? People's hearts can be found in very curious places.

George MacDonald tells a wonderful fairy story of a giant whose heart of flesh lived outside his body, and had to live there. The giant was very big and very strong, a mountain of a man, but he was always uneasy for fear that someone would come upon his heart where he had hidden it. If

his heart was pinched, it hurt him, and if it could be stabbed, he would be killed. Much trouble he took to leave it in safety. Sometimes he left it in his wife's keeping, the proper place, but he would come hurrying back, afraid that she had forgotten to watch over it. Sometimes he placed it in a very ordinary place where people would not think of looking for it. Then he would be seized with fear lest it should be thrown away as of no account. Yet again he would hide it among his treasures and fall in a panic lest some robbers should break through while he was away. And in the end one of his prisoners did find it, and, stabbing it, slew the great monster. You see then how important it would be to have your heart of flesh in the right place, if it *could* live outside you. But the heart that we love with *does* live outside us. Where, I wonder?

I declare that some children keep their heart in the sweet-shop. They are constantly thinking of what will taste nice. They are ready to give up almost anything for more good things to eat. Oh, what a place for a heart to stay in. It is always in danger of being trod on and hurt, and so greedy children are always complaining and whining and crying out for more.

Some people keep their hearts in their money-chests, that is to say, in the Bank cellars where their money stays. How do I know? Because if they lose their money they are heart-broken. Clearly the people who took away their money, unintentionally broke their heart when they broke into their money-chest.

Some people put their heart in their wife's or in their mother's hands. How do I know? The faintest reproach from mother or wife hurts far more than the loud rebuke of another person, for if anyone is holding your heart, the faintest twitch of their fingers hurts more than a heavy blow on the shoulder. All goes well so long as wife or mother lives; but, alas! if they die, what then? The heart entrusted to these dead fingers is buried too. That is why some people really seem to die when their beloved die. Their heart lies in the grave of their dear dead.

Ah, there is only one perfectly safe and perfectly happy place for your heart. That is the hands of the Lord Jesus. He keeps it safe through loss and gain, through life and death, your own and other people's. And the wonderful thing is that He places it in a mother's and wife's hands, but He holds it too. So we can really say, 'My heart is in my Lord's keeping and in my mother's too.' Then all is well.

Where is *your* heart then? Remember what Jesus said, 'Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also' (Mt 6^{21}).

June.

By the Rev. Robert Harvie, M.A., Earlston.

'I am the rose of Sharon.'—Cant 2^{1}.
'I will come again.'—Jn 14^{2}.

One of the earliest things I can remember is of having been taken to see streets and houses all gay with flags and banners and every kind of decoration. The stones had been taken up at the sides of the roadways, and flag-poles had been erected. At the top of each there was a banner, and, hanging between the poles, stretching across the streets, were great strings of evergreens. The whole scene was very bright, and though I've seen the same kind of thing since, yet I have never forgotten that first time I saw it, and how wonderful it all appeared.

The reason why it was all done was very simple. The Queen was coming to visit the city, and the people wanted her to see everything at its best.

The same thing is happening round about us in these days. This is the month of June, and June is the time of the rose. The trees are looking very beautiful, clothed in their most gorgeous garments of leaves. About this time we see the gardens and woods and hedges all gay with flowers, rich with beautiful colours, and fragrant with delightful scents. In fact, it looks as if, in the outside world, preparations were being made just like what I told you I once saw. And that is quite true. The same thing *is* happening. The Queen is coming. June is the month of the rose, and the rose is the Queen of the flowers.

Now let us come to the first of our texts. Perhaps you have heard that Sharon is a long stretch of land, which is very beautiful. It is covered with brightly coloured flowers, far more in number that any one could hope to count; and Jesus is called the Rose of Sharon.

There are two things in particular we admire about the rose. Whatever be its colour, it is always beautiful, and we could hardly help liking the rose on account of its sweet smell.

An old story says that when Adam and Eve were

in the garden of Eden, Eve stooped down to kiss one of God's beautiful flowers. It was a white rose, and after she had kissed it, red roses grew on that bush—red, the colour of her lips. But when they sinned, and were put out of the garden, roses were among the things they lost and saw no more. Then the story tells that once, after Jesus had been on the earth, there was a young girl—a Jewess—who loved Him and gave Him her heart. None of the people about her loved Him, and they were cruel enough to say that if she did not cease to love Him, she would be put to death. She refused, and they actually tied her to a post and were about to burn her. But they were disappointed, for instead of flames, there came up about her red and white roses which had never been seen since they were lost in Eden.

Well, that is the story, and even if it is not all true you can see what it means. When we sin against God, a great deal of the beauty and the sweetness goes out of our life, and it only comes back when we begin to love Christ and try to please Him, and are willing even to suffer to show that our love for Him is real.

God put men and women into the world. Their lives were once fresh and fair and sweet, but they sinned against God, and all that was lost. It came back into the world only when Jesus came. That is why He is called the Rose of Sharon.

Now you have read how Jesus was taken from the world into heaven, but in our second text He says, 'I will come again.' When He comes we shall want to be ready to give Him a royal welcome, and make every preparation to receive Him. I want just to give you one word of warning about His coming, and it is in the form of a story.

Away out in the Pacific Ocean there is an island where there were a great number of people suffering from a terrible disease called leprosy. It made them not very pleasant to look at, yet they could not be cured. Once the Queen of the Islands was to visit this place, and was to speak a few kind words to these people. All the lepers were dressed in their finest clothes, and the place was decorated with banners and arches of flowers. Yet, in spite of all that, the Queen saw how miserable the people were, and how terrible was this disease they had—and when the time came for her to make her speech, she burst into tears and could not say a single word.

You see what the story means for us? Jesus has promised He is coming back to us. I wonder what He will find when He does come? What He thinks of is not the clothes we wear, nor the things we do when we know others see us. He can see right past all that, into our hearts, and He is never deceived. He is only vexed if our hearts are not pure and clean.

The best way to get ready to receive Him when He comes again, is to ask God to cleanse our hearts, to give us hearts full of love for Jesus. He will then come and abide with us. If you do that now, you will remember June as the month of the rose, for Jesus is the Rose of Sharon.

Cura Curarum.

By the Rev. A. F. Taylor, M.A., St. Cyrus.

'There is a temptation to devote ourselves to a variety of pursuits, other than those which properly belong to us, to such an extent as to obscure our character and weaken our influence as spiritual leaders. . . . We sometimes attempt to do too many things even of the kind that may be rightly included in our sphere.'—Robinson's *Personal Life of the Clergy*.

'For the average man the attempt to do too much is more likely than not to lead to serious failure.'—*Idem*.

'The priest and pastor has sometimes been merged and lost in the social leader and political reformer, or, more disastrous yet, he has descended to a level at which he has been regarded as little more than a successful provider of popular amusements.'—*Idem*.

'There were political oppressions to be remedied, there were social unrighteousness and iniquity to be condemned, but Jesus does not fling Himself into these social issues of the time. He moves through them with a strange tranquillity, not as one who is indifferent to them, but as one whose eye is fixed on an end in which these social problems will find their own solution.'—Prof. Peabody.

'Many a parish would be greatly a gainer if its clergy were less ready and indeed eager to do everything themselves. . . . There is such a thing as the sacred principle of delegation.'—Robinson's *Personal Life of the Clergy*.

'Limit your work that you may extend your influence. It is quality, not quantity, that tells. The work done by the worker in a healthful condition of mind and spirit, calmed and sustained by the consciousness of the divine approval and guidance, and which inevitably disappears in an atmosphere of hurry and bustle, is the work that is really fruitful of results that remain.'—*Idem.*

'In all the professions a man's first duty now is to renounce the ambition of becoming distinguished for activity; the temptation chiefly to be avoided is that of undertaking more than he can do in first-rate style. The quality of work must be improved, and to that end, if necessary, the quantity reduced. A higher, calmer sort of activity must be arrived at —economy in energy, expenditure without waste, zeal without haste.'—*Idem.*

'I beseech you not to waste in a few spasmodic efforts the strength and usefulness of years. I beseech you to regard the care of your health. . . . But within this limit work with life, with courage, with strength of purpose, with unfaltering faith in God.'—W. E. Channing—An Ordination Address.

'To seize the universal in the particular is the great heart of wisdom, and this is especially important to one who has to live amidst details.'—W. E. Channing—An Ordination Address.

'What is the secret of happiness? There is, I think, only one answer. The secret of happiness is self-surrender. Not self-extinction, for there can be no happiness in a mere negation. Not self-repression, for that is a difficult and painful process. No! but the consecration of our faculties in some congenial impersonal object, patriotic, social, religious, or artistic, which enriches our personality by making it typical of and continuous with something of permanent interest, human or divine, or both, and at the same time purges it of the poison of Egotism. The rivulet brawls and foams and frets so long as it is only a rivulet; it finds calm and clearness when it is merged in the wide brimming river. So with the soul of man when it merges itself in some great idea; with this difference, that in so doing it does not lose but find itself—as the greatest of teachers taught us long ago.'—'W. P.' in *Glasgow Herald*, October 19, 1912.

Apollinaris of Laodicea.

By the Rev. Dawson Walker, M.A., D.D., Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Durham.

II.

What was the distinctive teaching of Apollinaris, and how did it originate? Let us recall the general situation in a few words. The teaching of Arius had called into question the Divinity of Christ. In attempting to meet the very real difficulty: 'How can God be One and yet Christ also be God?' he had given an answer which in fact surrendered the Godhead of Christ. Arius had been the pupil of Lucian of Antioch, and, like him, seems to have combined the adoptianist theory of Paul of Samosata, with the Logos doctrine of the Eastern Church, and so arrived at the conception of a created but pre-existent Logos. All the energies of Athanasius and of those who supported him—amongst them Apollinaris—were directed to the establishment of the Homoousion —the absolute Godhead of Christ. On this point, so far as the Catholic Church was concerned, the victory was won. Harnack, no very sympathetic critic of Athanasius, tells us that it was he 'who first arrived at the *contradictio in adjecto* in the full sense of the phrase';[1] which is Harnack's way of saying that under the leadership of Athanasius the Church was committed to the view that the man Jesus Christ is 'Very God of Very God." The Christian Church, with Judaism on the one side and the Gentile world on the other, was compelled to formulate its idea of God. The result, achieved by a process of scriptural exegesis, per-

[1] *History of Dogma*, vol. iv. p. 46.

sonal spiritual experience, and speculative reflection, was the Christian doctrine of the Trinity—in the development and maintenance of which Apollinaris himself took a considerable part.

But, once the divinity of Christ had been vindicated, a further problem was bound to arise. If He was indeed the God-Man, in what way was the co-existence of Godhead and manhood in Him to be expressed? What was the mode of their inter-relation? Was the Logos, the Divine in Christ, merely joined with humanity, or absolutely transformed into it? Or, in becoming Man, had He transformed the human into the Divine; or, in deifying the human had He left its distinctive nature intact? Or, had He really not deified it at all, but merely associated it with the Godhead? Furthermore, how, from this point of view, were the statements about our Lord in the Gospels to be interpreted? Was it merely the flesh, the man, that was born of the Virgin Mary, or was the Logos born of her, together with the flesh? Who is it who suffers, who hungers, who thirsts? Is it man only—or the God-man? Who is it—on the other hand, who heals the sick, controls the forces of nature, forgives sins? Is it God only—or the God-man?[1] The demands both of scriptural exegesis and of philosophic reflection were insistent on these points. Is the Christ, for whom the faith and the hope of humanity are claimed as its Lord and its Redeemer, really two persons? Or, if He be one, how is the unity to be conceived and expressed?

This, or something like it, was the problem, of which Apollinaris propounded a solution. From what point and along what lines did he approach it? He approached it in the first instance as the sworn foe of Arianism and the determined upholder of the orthodox Nicene Faith. It was an element in the Arian conception of Christ, the Logos, that He was capable of change like other created beings (*τρεπτὸς φύσει ὡς τὰ κτίσματα*). They laid emphasis on the freedom of choice (*τὸ τρεπτόν*) of the Logos. They held that He was subject to growth and development, and that in every case wherein He chose the good it was the free act of a will that might conceivably have chosen otherwise. It was this mutability, this freedom of choice, in Christ which seemed to Apollinaris a wrong and indefensible conception. Two aspects in particular were open to objection.

[1] Cf. Harnack, *u.s.* p. 142.

It seemed, in the first place, to follow from this hypothesis of freedom, that 'the redemption effected by Christ was only the work of a finite being who made Himself redeemer by His own free act,'[2] and therefore was not really a redemption effected for the human race, so much as an example to it how it might redeem itself. As Harnack well expresses it: 'Everything that Christ had done for us, God must have done, otherwise it has no saving power. Everything that He did must be perfect, else it avails us nothing.'[3] Zeal for the absolute divinity of Christ was here the nerve of the Apollinarian argument.

But, secondly, there was this further important aspect of the matter. So far as we are conversant with humanity, where there is freedom of choice there is, as a matter of fact, sin. No soul that is really human is wholly free from sin. Man's *νοῦς*, his intellect, is not only the organ of his free choice, it is the seat of his sinful instincts. And therefore in surrendering the changelessness of Christ we have surrendered His sinlessness as well.

And these two things, the changelessness and the sinlessness of Christ, in other words His absolute divinity, must, according to Apollinaris, be fully safeguarded if the effectiveness of His redeeming work was to be maintained. Christ was certainly, and admittedly, Man. It must in some comprehensible and convincing way be shown that He was also God. The Divine nature and the human must be shewn to co-exist in Him.

But here a further difficulty emerged. To Apollinaris a complete 'nature' was, in effect, neither more nor less than a 'person.' We have to observe carefully the confusion in terminology here involved; for it pervaded much of the subsequent thinking. The union of a complete Divine nature with a complete human nature was tantamount to the union of a Divine person with a human person. Such a twofold personality could not be acquiesced in as a final solution of the Christological problem. The Christian thinker who would understand Christ aright must devise some method of transcending it.

We have seen what the general conditions of the problem were. We have also seen how through the exigencies of Arian controversy it forced itself upon Apollinaris. Let us now try to follow a little

[2] Dorner, *u.s.* p. 360.

[3] Harnack, *u.s.* p. 152.

more closely the track of thought along which he moved to the solution which he propounded.

Up to a certain point and on certain fundamental propositions he agreed with his opponents. With them he held it as axiomatic that two perfect things can never be combined in a unity; δύο τέλεια ἓν γενέσθαι οὐ δύναται. A perfect God and a perfect man can never make a uniform being. If a perfect God had been joined to a perfect Man, there would have been two, one Son of God by nature, the other by adoption. The combination of two wholes into one whole was unthinkable. It was the stultification of any idea of unity at all, and must at all costs be rejected. In this general attitude we trace the Antiochene tradition that had come from Paul of Samosata who was driven to conclude, as the result of it, that Christ was ἄνθρωπος ἔνθεος, a 'deified man.'

But Apollinaris, while accepting the general premisses, would by no means draw the same conclusion. His grasp on the Nicene Faith was too strong to permit that. To be absolutely human meant, for him, to be both free in choice and sinful in disposition. And humanity, so construed, could not be predicated of Christ. There was not only a metaphysical impossibility, but an ethical incongruity. To Apollinaris it seemed that to attribute perfect humanity to Christ was *ipso facto* to make Him imperfect. And so he arrived at the proposition that Christ is perfect with Divine perfection and not with human perfection.

He could not, then, accept the Antiochene definition of unity as formulated by Paul of Samosata and the Lucianists. What was his own? It is not difficult to see the line on which his thought must move. If Divinity and humanity cannot combine as two absolute wholes; if the Divine is certainly absolute and unmodified: then such modification as is necessary in order to make alliance with the Divine possible must take place in the sphere of the human.

Now, in order to understand his teaching on the point, we must here recall his view as to the constituent elements in human personality. He seems at first to have conceived that the constituent elements were twofold—soul and body. Later he modified this, and adapted the view, popularized by Plato, and appearing in the Pauline Epistles, that our personality is essentially threefold: body, soul, and spirit; the soul being the animal or irrational life, in contrast with the higher controlling, self-determining element of spirit or rational life.

Now for Apollinaris this third highest element, the rational soul or spirit, was the distinctive determining element in human personality. Here lay the seat of self-determination, and so of personal distinction; here too lay that power of choosing which as a matter of fact involved the possibility of evil choice. Here too, in humanity as known to us, lay not merely the possibility but the actuality of evil. Our rational soul, he said, is under condemnation. Where there is full or complete humanity there is sin. If Christ assumed human attributes in their entirety, He must have assumed human reasoning powers (λογισμοί), and it is impossible for these to be free from inherent sin.

If, then, the νοῦς or πνεῦμα is necessarily the seat of sin, it cannot as such find a place in the perfect being of Christ. Something that is free from variability and liability to sin must take its place. That something is found in the Divine Logos Himself. At the Incarnation the Logos took to Himself an 'animal' soul and a human body, Himself taking the place of the 'rational soul'; in this way eliminating the element of mutability and possible sin. The Logos was a prevailing principle of holiness, supplying the place of that νοῦς which in Adam had fallen under the dominion of the flesh. In this way it seemed to Apollinaris that the sinlessness of Christ was secured, because the possibility of moral evil appeared to be effectually excluded from His human nature.

And not only so, but the desiderated unity of His Person was secured as well. The Logos could not combine with a rational human soul, because there would then be two self-determining centres, and so two wills, involving a permanent and unthinkable antithesis. But if the Logos did not combine with the 'rational soul,' but *supplanted* it, then you arrive at the sought-for unity. You have *one* centre of self-determination, one controlling principle and power, the Logos Himself, representing the perfect life and perfect will of God. In this sense, and in this way, 'the Word became flesh.' And the result of the Incarnation was not the union of two 'natures,' but a new and resultant one God made flesh (θεὸς σαρκωθείς). 'Neither man wholly, nor God wholly, but a mingling of God and man.' Or, in the phrase

originated by Apollinaris, and afterwards to become so famous, 'one incarnate nature of the God Word.' It is true that this idea of a new Divine nature as a result of 'mixing' seems to conflict with what was said above about the Divine remaining 'intact.' But it is only in appearance. The Divine element, the Logos, is there fully present, completely filling and animating the human elements with the higher life of God. It is the humanity that has suffered modification and alteration.

One criticism of this teaching is not far to seek, and may be expressed at once. It is that the Person of Christ as conceived by Apollinaris is open, so far as the human element in it is concerned, to the charge of unreality. If a human being consists essentially of spirit, soul and body, then a being who consists of Logos, soul and body, cannot in any real sense be called human. This criticism is to be emphasized partly because of its element of truth, and partly because the anticipation of it by Apollinaris gives the occasion for what is perhaps the grandest, most profound and most attractive element in his whole doctrinal position.

He finds the basis for it in certain well-known passages of New Testament Scripture. This is in entire harmony with his general practice; for he was above all an exact and careful exponent of the Bible. There is the familiar Pauline passage in which Christ is set forth as the second, the spiritual Adam.[1] There is the further Pauline passage in which we are told that this 'second man is from heaven.'[2] There is St. John's reference to 'the Son of Man which is in heaven.'[3] There is, again, the Pauline conception of Christ as the one Mediator between God and Man.[4] From a combination of the ideas here set forth, Apollinaris deduced the conception that the Logos, Who in Christ took the place of the rational soul, so far from being alien to humanity, was in reality its truest expression. The Logos, in other words, is not only the image of God, but He is also, from all eternity, the archetype of mankind. The Logos was from eternity destined to become incarnate—had in Himself from all eternity the 'potency' of, the capacity for, the Incarnation. Which may almost be expressed by saying that there has always, from all eternity, been something of the human in the Godhead. And from this point of view the conception becomes intelligible that, so far from humanity in the Person of Christ being unreal or incomplete, it is in Him for the first time that it finds real and complete expression. If the Logos was Himself the very truth of human nature, if He is more truly human than any individual of the species; if, so far from being foreign to, He constitutes rather the perfection of the humanity; if it was only when the Word became flesh that humanity reached its Divinely predestined goal, and our fallen nature was restored to its archetypal sinlessness—then indeed all charges of unreality, all suggestions of a mutilated humanity, fall completely to the ground.

It may fairly be questioned whether in the lifetime of Apollinaris, or ever since, this sublime and thoroughly scriptural conception has ever been treated with adequate justice and comprehension. It has been said, and not without reason, that it was a conception 'to which the Church of that time was not fitted to do justice.'[5] It has also been said—with equal reason—that 'the recognition of the natural affinity existing between the human soul and God might have smoothed the way to a really satisfactory doctrine of the Person of Christ.'[6]

This, then, in a meagre, but I hope, intelligible outline, is the contribution of Apollinaris to the solution of the Christological problem. He wished to safeguard in the most absolute way two great truths: the Divinity of our Lord and the unity of His Person. And it will be readily admitted that in the solution which he offered, those two truths are unquestionably maintained intact; for him the one Christ was very God incarnate. It remains now to be seen whether his view of the Person of Christ did full and adequate justice to the humanity. Could the view that Christ, with Logos, soul and body, was more really and truly human than any other man, stand the test of full and exhaustive examination?

The answer of the Catholic Church, indicated first in the writings of various theologians, and finally expressed in conciliar enactment, was that the teaching of Apollinaris could not be accepted as a finally acceptable statement of the truth. What, then, were the reasons for which it was found to be inadequate?

It is interesting to observe that one great principle

[1] Ro 5^{12-19}. [2] 1 Co 15^{47}.
[3] Jn 3^{13}. [4] 1 Ti 2^{5}.

[5] Orr, *Progress of Dogma*, p. 180.
[6] Bethune-Baker, *u.s.* p. 244.

which had animated Apollinaris in his construction of the Person of Christ formed the very nerve and motive power of the refusal to accept it. And that was the intense desire to maintain the reality and the effectiveness of Christ's work as Redeemer. In maintaining this he had rightly shewn that if the work of redemption is to be truly accomplished, it must be God's work; it must contain the flawlessness, the perfection which God alone can supply. Apart from this, it might be, at best, a worthy example; it could not be effective redemption. In reply to him, it was maintained that the rational soul, the spirit, is the most important, the most distinctive element (*τὸ κυριώτατον*) in our human nature. It is the very seat of our personality where our need for redemption is greatest. And therefore, that if Christ had not, in the sense that we have, a human soul, it put Him at once in a sphere remote from us, and placed him out of all effective relation to us. He could not be our Redeemer; He could not even be our example. Because, in the last analysis, He was not really human at all (*οὐχ ὁμοούσιος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατὰ τὸ κυριώτατον*).

There was also the further point, to which allusion has been made, that it was precisely this part or element in our personality which is the seat of sin. The spirit, as well as the soul and body, must be the object of redeeming and restoring work. And, according to the thesis of Apollinaris, it was precisely the element wherein the need for redemption was greatest that had *not* been assumed by Christ. And, as Gregory Nazianzen said, 'what has not been assumed has not been saved.' If Christ's humanity was but partial, then His redemption was incomplete.

It was difficult also for the theory of Apollinaris to evade the charge of being really docetic in its character. It did introduce an element of unreality. To the plain man, at any rate, it meant, that while Christ *seemed* to be man He was not really so. If 'the Godhead without constraint swayed the manhood'; if Christ had really no human will to be surrendered voluntarily to the Father's will, then there could neither be growth nor probation in His earthly experience. On this assumption what intelligible meaning could be given to the words: 'Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and men';[1] 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin'?[2] It was on these, and other kindred passages, that the School of Antioch laid emphasis, in its strenuous maintenance of the fulness and reality of our Lord's humanity. The reality of Christ's human nature, it was felt, would be undermined and destroyed if the theory of Apollinaris should be carried out to its only logical issue.

So his teaching on the Person of our Lord was rejected and condemned. The Western Church rejected it in 377 A.D. and 378 A.D. in Synods held at Rome. It was rejected by the Second General Council of 381 A.D. In 375 A.D. he appears to have withdrawn from the Church, and his followers were formed into a separate communion. Between 388 A.D. and 428 A.D. various Imperial edicts were issued prohibiting their assemblage for worship, and they appear ultimately either to have rejoined the Catholic Church or to have swelled the ranks of the Monophysites.

What, then, are we to say of the work of Apollinaris and of the criticism to which his Christological teaching has been subjected? Much of his work, as we have already seen, was a contribution, valued by all, to the constructive process of Christian doctrine. He took a leading part in the defence of the Nicene Creed against the Arians; he largely helped in establishing the doctrine of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit. In fact, he assisted in no slight measure, in the formulation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. To have done as much as this was to render a great service to the thought of Christendom. But he was one of the first to see that this statement of the Christian doctrine of God, compelled the Church to formulate as well its doctrine of the Person of Christ. How was personality related to nature? Did the conjunction of Divinity and humanity in Christ mean that in Him a Divine person was united to a human person? On this great issue the teaching of Apollinaris was in harmony with the ultimate verdict of the Church. He rejected the idea that the humanity of Christ was 'personal' and so preserved the oneness of His Person. He was also at one with teaching subsequently accepted as Catholic, in finding the centre of Christ's personality in the Logos. The Word became flesh; God became man. The God Who became man was personal, the manhood which He took was impersonal. To speak of this here is to anticipate further stages of theological reflexion. It is only

[1] Lk 2^{52}.

[2] He 4^{15}.

mentioned now to shew the wide extent of the agreement between Apollinaris and the views which afterwards were held as orthodox. Finally, it must not be forgotten that he was the author of the formula, 'One incarnate nature of the God-Word,' so emphasized by Cyril of Alexandria in his vindication against the Nestorians of the unity of the Person of Christ.

And what of the criticism upon his work? He attempted to define the manner of the union between the Godhead and the manhood in the Person of Christ. And if this attempt be written down a failure, it may at any rate be conceded that it was a splendid failure. And further, where he failed no other man has yet succeeded. No one of the opponents of Apollinaris was able to express the union in any satisfactory manner. And it may fairly be questioned whether his sublime conception of the eternal humanity of the Logos, in virtue of which Christ was not imperfect, but the first perfect man, has ever yet received its full measure of justice. If once it were admitted it destroyed the force of the criticism, that the Apollinarian theory destroyed the perfection of Christ's humanity.

This, at any rate,—the charge that his view impaired the perfection of Christ's humanity—was the ground on which the Church declined the teaching of Apollinaris. And in maintaining, in this decided way, the thought of the perfect humanity of Christ, the Church, as Harnack frankly admits, did an inestimable service to later generations. For the aim of the Church, throughout all this period of intricate and complicated controversy, was not to furnish an exhaustive definition of the Person of Christ, not to provide a *rationale* of the Incarnation, but to maintain the absolute integrity of the fact of Christ as presented in the pages of Scripture; to maintain it intact in the face of the theories and speculations which professed to explain it, but really mutilated it in various ways. The mystery of Christ's Person was a challenge to the thought of the Early Church, as it is to our thought to-day. We may recognize and appreciate the consummate ability of an attempt such as that of Apollinaris to penetrate to the heart of the mystery and unfold its inner meaning. But we may thank God that the Church would accept no teaching, which even had the appearance of detracting from the Scripture presentment of Christ as perfect God and perfect Man. She could do no better service to succeeding ages than to hand down to them that Scripture presentment—unexplained perhaps, but intact in all its fulness. And we shall be wise in imitating the example which she set. Speculation is still occupied with Christ, and theories of His Person are submitted for an acceptance. For any help they give we may be grateful; but the Christ of Whom they speak, Whom we revere and worship, must be transmitted by us in all His fulness to the generations yet to come.

Literature.

IMMORTALITY.

The University of St. Andrews invited Dr. J. G. Frazer to deliver the Gifford Lectures there in the session of 1911–12. He accepted the invitation, and lectured on *The Belief in Immortality*. The volume containing the lectures, together with twelve lectures on 'The Fear and Worship of the Dead,' delivered at Cambridge and repeated at St. Andrews, has been published by Messrs. Macmillan (10s. net). This volume, which is to be followed by another on the subject, contains an account of the belief in Immortality among the Aborigines of Australia, the Torres Straits Islands, New Guinea, and Melanesia.

Is the subject attractive? It does not matter what the subject is; in Dr. Frazer's hands every subject is attractive and absorbing. No doubt the day is come when everything belonging to religion, whether civilized or uncivilized, is of interest. And the ideas and practices of the Australian aborigines touching survival after death are sure to find readers in plenty, whoever writes about them. But we must remember that it was Dr. Frazer more than any man who brought that to pass. First his *Golden Bough*, with its amazing wealth of information and its unfailing charm of language, came to tell us how true it is that God has made of one blood all nations to dwell on all the face of the earth; and then it was easy for

other writers and other books to catch our attention. So it would have been a pleasant course of lectures to listen to, and a pleasant book to read, whatever had been the subject.

But the subject is Immortality. It is death and the beyond. It is the perpetually recurring question:

Is this the end? Is this the end?

So anxious are men to find their hopes confirmed that it is something to be told that belief in survival after death is almost universal. We wish to hear Dr. Frazer's very words: 'The question whether our conscious personality survives after death has been answered by almost all races of men in the affirmative. On this point sceptical or agnostic peoples are nearly, if not wholly, unknown. Accordingly if abstract truth could be determined, like the gravest issues of national policy, by a show of hands or a counting of heads, the doctrine of human immortality, or at least of a life after death, would deserve to rank among the most firmly established of truths; for were the question put to the vote of the whole of mankind, there can be no doubt that the ayes would have it by an overwhelming majority.'

But there are more important things in this volume than that, important as the belief in immortality is. There are stories of man's inhumanity to man—or woman—in this life, an inhumanity which is due to some sort of belief in a life to come, that move us more deeply. In Fiji 'wives were often strangled, or buried alive, at the funeral of their husbands, and generally at their own instance. Such scenes were frequently witnessed by white residents in the old days. On one occasion a Mr. David Whippy drove away the murderers, rescued the woman, and carried her to his own house, where she was resuscitated. But, far from feeling grateful for her preservation, she loaded him with reproaches and ever afterwards manifested the most deadly hatred towards him. "That women should desire to accompany their husbands in death, is by no means strange when it is considered that it is one of the articles of their belief, that in this way alone can they reach the realms of bliss, and she who meets her death with the greatest devotedness, will become the favourite wife in the abode of spirits. The sacrifice is not, however, always voluntary; but, when a woman refuses to be strangled, her relations often compel her to submit. This they do from interested motives; for, by her death, her connections become entitled to the property of her husband. Even a delay is made a matter of reproach. Thus, at the funeral of the late king Ulivou, which was witnessed by Mr. Cargill, his five wives and a daughter were strangled. The principal wife delayed the ceremony, by taking leave of those around her; whereupon Tanoa, the present king, chid her. The victim was his own aunt, and he assisted in putting the rope around her neck, and strangling her, a service he is said to have rendered on a former occasion to his own mother." In the case of men who were drowned at sea or killed and eaten by enemies in war, their wives were sacrificed in the usual way. Thus when Ra Mbithi, the pride of Somosomo, was lost at sea, seventeen of his wives were destroyed; and after the news of a massacre of the Namena people at Viwa in 1839, eighty women were strangled to accompany the spirits of their murdered husbands.

'The bodies of women who were put to death for this purpose were regularly laid at the bottom of the grave to serve as a cushion for the dead husband to lie upon; in this capacity they were called grass (*thotho*), being compared to the dried grass which in Fijian houses used to be thickly strewn on the floors and covered with mats. On this point, however, a nice distinction was observed. While wives were commonly sacrificed at the death of their husbands, in order to be spread like grass in their graves, it does not transpire that husbands were ever sacrificed at the death of their wives for the sake of serving as grass to their dead spouses in the grave. The great truth that all flesh is grass appears to have been understood by the Fijians as applicable chiefly to the flesh of women. Sometimes a man's mother was strangled as well as his wives. Thus Ngavindi, a young chief of Lasakau, was laid in the grave with a wife at his side, his mother at his feet, and a servant not far off.'

SCHLEIERMACHER.

The study of Schleiermacher is the natural entrance into the knowledge of modern theology. It is a pity that Schleiermacher is so difficult to study, for nothing can take the place of his own writings. But the excessive difficulty being undeniable, a difficulty which is due partly to the

progress of his thinking and partly to the badness of his style, it is right and proper to begin with some introduction. And it is not possible to begin with a better introduction than that which simply goes by the title of *Schleiermacher* and has been written by the Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford (Chapman & Hall; 7s. 6d. net).

Dr. Selbie is not difficult. He has an easy control of the English language, and he has studied Schleiermacher long enough to know what can be known and clearly expressed in his writings. The book is an exposition of these writings. There is a short sketch of the theologian's life to begin with. Then comes the exposition. It is not an exposition of each separate work. That would have had its advantages, and the plan must have occurred to Dr. Selbie as a tempting one, with so manifestly progressive a thinker as Schleiermacher. But we are glad that he set it aside. His method is to take theology in its parts or doctrines and tell us what Schleiermacher had to say on each doctrine.

The most difficult matter to manage successfully is Schleiermacher's approach to pantheism. Dr. Selbie states the evidence for and against. He does not acquit the theologian of the charge of being a pantheist; but he shows clearly enough that his pantheism did not seriously, and certainly did not fundamentally, affect his theology or any doctrine of it.

No one need be surprised to find that Principal Selbie gives Schleiermacher an influential place in the development of modern theology. For, however it has come about, it is just those things which Schleiermacher laid emphasis on that have proved most attractive to the modern mind and most capable of scientific expansion. Thus, the tendency to emphasize the experimental side of religion is, as Dr. Selbie says, a feature of present-day theology, and it is to Schleiermacher that we owe the first impulse towards it.

LUTHER.

It is a strange but evidently an irresistible fascination that Luther possesses for the Roman Catholic. Several Lives of Luther or extensive articles on him by Roman Catholics have appeared of late; and here is another biography, an immense biography by Professor Hartmann Grisar, S.J., of Innsbruck, in two handsome volumes, though as yet only the first volume has been issued (Kegan Paul; 12s. net).

Professor Grisar is hard on Luther. Perhaps no Roman Catholic can help it. But it is significant that he is hard on the anti-Lutherans also. He attributes bad temper and other serious infirmities to Luther, but he attributes bad lives and yet more serious sins to Luther's enemies. He shows us, indeed, though not deliberately, that some reformation of religion was both imperative and inevitable. And he gives no sufficient reason for doubting that it should have come by the hand of Luther.

In the life of Luther there are many things that are doubtful and disputed. On most of them Professor Grisar takes the side that is least creditable to the Reformer. But he is far from being overwhelmed with prejudice. He really investigates, uses good authorities, and gives reasons for his judgments.

Perhaps we cannot do better than quote the account which Dr. Grisar gives of the Scala Santa incident in Rome.

'He came to the so-called Scala Santa at the Lateran, and saw the Faithful, from motives of penance, ascending the holy steps on their knees. He turned away from this touching popular veneration of the sufferings of the Redeemer, and preferred not to follow the example of the other pilgrims. An account given by his son Paul in 1582 says that he then quoted the Bible verse: "The just man liveth by faith." If it be a fact that he made use of these words, which were to assume so great importance and to be so sadly misinterpreted in his subsequent theology, it was certainly not in their later sense. In reality we have here in all probability an instance of a later opinion being gratuitously anticipated, for Luther himself declares that he discovered his gospel only after he had taken his Doctor's degree, and this we shall show abundantly further on. Older Protestant writers have frequently represented the scene at the steps of the Lateran in unhistorical colours, owing to their desire to furnish a graphic historical beginning of the change in Luther's mind. Mylius of Jena was one of the first to do this. Mylius, in 1595, quite falsely asserts that Luther had already commented on the Epistle to the Romans previous to his journey to Rome, and adds that he had already then noted the later interpretation of the Bible text in question. It is

true that his son Paul, where he speaks of Luther's exclamation as having been communicated to him by his father, expressly states that "he had *then*, through the spirit of Jesus, come to the knowledge of the truth of the holy gospel." But Köstlin's Biography of Luther rightly denies this, and describes it as an "exaggeration"—"error" would have been better—for the assumption to which Luther's friends still cling with such affection, namely, that from the very commencement of his journey to Rome he had been "haunted by the Bible text concerning justification by faith," at a time "when he still was striving to serve God by his own works," must be struck out of history as a mere fiction.'

THE HISTORY OF MAGIC.

Alphonse Louis Constant was born at Paris in 1810, and was the son of a shoemaker, apparently in very poor circumstances. His precocity in childhood seemed to give some promise of future ability; he was brought to the notice of a priest belonging to his parish, and this in its turn led to his gratuitous education at Saint Sulpice, obviously with a view to the priesthood. There his superiors must have recognized sufficient traces of vocation, according to the measures of the particular place and period, for he proceeded to minor orders and subsequently became a deacon. He seems, however, to have conceived strange views on doctrinal subjects, though no particulars are forthcoming, and, being deficient in gifts of silence, the displeasure of authority was marked by various checks, ending finally in his expulsion from the Seminary.

He married Noémy, a girl of sixteen, who became afterwards of some repute as a sculptor, but it was a runaway match, and in the end she left him.

In the year 1851 Alphonse Louis Constant contributed a large volume to the encyclopædic series of Abbé Migne, under the title of *Dictionnaire de Littérature Chrétienne*. He is described therein as *ancien professeur au petit Séminaire de Paris*, and it is to be supposed that his past was unknown at the publishing bureau.

Four years later the voice of the churchman, speaking the characteristic language of the Migne Encyclopædias, was succeeded by the voice of the magus. The *Doctrine of Transcendental Magic* appeared in 1855, the *Ritual* in 1856, and henceforth Alphonse Louis Constant, under the pseudonym of Éliphas Lévi, which has become almost of European celebrity, was known only as an exponent of occult science. It is these works which more especially embody his claims in respect of the alleged science and in respect of his own absolute authority therein.

He was in Paris during the siege which brought the Franco-German War to its disastrous close, and he died in 1875, fortified by the last rites of the Catholic Church.

This is the man whose greatest book, *The History of Magic*, has been translated into English by Mr. Arthur Edward Waite (Rider; 15s. net). 'I have not translated the book,' says Mr. Waite, 'because it is entertaining and brilliant, or because it will afford those who are concerned with Magic in history a serviceable general account. The task has been undertaken still less in the interests of any who may have other—that is to say, occult—reasons for acquaintance with "its procedure, its rites and its mysteries." I have no object in providing unwary and foolish seekers with material of this kind, and it so happens that the present History does not fulfil the promise of its sub-title in these respects, or at least to any extent that they would term practical in their folly. Through all my later literary life I have sought to make it plain, as the result of antecedent years spent in occult research, that the occult sciences—in all their general understanding—are paths of danger when they are not paths of simple make-believe and imposture. The importance of Éliphas Lévi's account at large of the claims, and of their story throughout the centuries, arises from the fact (*a*) that he is the authoritative exponent-in-chief of all the alleged sciences; (*b*) that it is he who, in a sense, restored and placed them, under a new and more attractive vesture, before public notice at the middle period of the nineteenth century; (*c*) that he claimed the very fullest knowledge concerning them, being that of an adept and master; but (*d*) that it follows from his long examination that Magic, as understood not in the streets only but in the houses of research concerning it, has no ground in the truth of things, and is of the region of delusion only. It is for this reason that I have translated his *History of Magic*, as one who reckons a not too gracious task for something which leans toward righteousness, at least in the sense of charity.'

Mr. Waite has not only translated the book, he has added notes to it and he has written a preface. The preface contains the biography of Éliphas Lévi summarized above, together with much curious information about Magic generally and Lévi's ideas regarding it in particular. The notes are as valuable as they are necessary. They are necessary to correct mistakes not a few into which Lévi fell through carelessness, and also mistakes due to ignorance, whether his own or his generation's. And Mr. Waite has so corrected these mistakes as to add materially to the value of the book.

It is a handsome volume of something like 570 pages, and it is illustrated with all the original illustrations together with portraits of its author.

THE NEAR EAST.

Mr. H. R. Hall of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, is a highly accomplished scholar and he has a covetable command of the English language. His contributions to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, together with his book on the *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, have encouraged us to expect from him the finest literary work. He has just finished and had published *The Ancient History of the Near East* (Methuen; 15s. net).

It is a volume of six hundred large octavo pages, but it is one volume only. To bring within that space the history as it is now known of ancient Greece, Egypt, Babylonia, the Hittites, the Syrians and Israelites, the Assyrian Empire, and the Medes and Persians, is an undertaking that could have been carried out successfully only by a man who had the most complete command of his subject and of himself. No wonder that he regrets that some matters of interest had to be omitted. His readers, however, whether they are the Oxford undergraduates, for whom he writes most immediately, or the wider 'general' readers, who simply want to know, will not regret any omission that has brought the whole history within this compass, especially as such occasional omission has kept the book from being superficial and sketchy, and has left room for colour and for concreteness. Besides, when the undergraduate becomes a graduate and the general reader particular, they will proceed to separate histories of these nations, and they will never forget the debt they owe to Mr. Hall's mastery of that most difficult art, the art of writing a small book on a great subject.

The latest discovery is taken account of, wherever it has been made or by whom, and the adjustment of our knowledge to its demands has been carried out. In order to do this, in order to be quite up to date, Mr. Hall has rewritten certain pages over and over again. And now he publishes because there is a lull in discovery. He has been able at least to get his book out before it is antiquated.

It need never be antiquated. That is to say, if we start with this book as we have it, everything in it being at present the last word of science on its subject, we can ourselves watch the discoveries that are made and add or modify Mr. Hall as we find necessary. The great matter is to get a thorough grasp of the history as a whole, and that great thing has been done for us.

The book is furnished with thirty-three plates and fourteen maps.

ST. PAUL AND JUSTIFICATION.

A book has been published by Messrs. Macmillan with the title of *St. Paul and Justification* (6s. net). It is an exposition of the teaching of St. Paul on Justification in the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Romans. Its author is the Ven. Frederick Brooke Westcott, B.D., Archdeacon of Norwich, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The manner of Archdeacon Westcott is as different as it could be from that of his father, the Bishop of Durham. He is a scholar, as every line of this book testifies, but he has no confidence in his scholarship. The Bishop was a scholar and knew it. Again, he writes in a free and familiar style and with perfect lucidity, whereas his father was often accused of haziness and always wrote with the sense of a great responsibility. We are not invited to choose between the men. If we were we should prefer to read the Archdeacon.

The Epistles to Galatia and to Rome are expounded verse by verse, always with an eye to their teaching on Justification. The Apostle's language is illustrated with extraordinary felicity. And even when a difficulty remains unravelled we are told that it remains. Then when the exposition is finished a short section gives us a bird's-eye view of the doctrine of each Epistle.

Thus, of Galatians Mr. Westcott says: 'As one peruses the Epistle, it is borne in on the mind that, whatever it may be, it is not a formal treatise. It has all the free discursiveness of a thoroughly natural letter. Great ideas pervade it throughout; but they appear to defy analysis. And one feels (one cannot help feeling) that St. Paul would have been mightily surprised if he could have learned of the dogmatic superstructure to be afterwards upreared on the great ideas thrown out in the course of his eager writing.

'These ideas, on a broad survey, would appear to be chiefly two.

'Granted all would stand well with God, they can only attain their wish by what is called "faith in Christ." This is not very clearly defined, probably primarily because it defies all definition. From this "faith," further, flows a notable consequence, the gift of the Holy Spirit.'

At the end of the exposition of Romans, Archdeacon Westcott says: 'When I was a schoolmaster (and they were very happy days, as all schoolmasters find them) there was no department of my work which pleased me more than the teaching of the New Testament. The "fly in the ointment" was the necessity of examination; for I was very well aware it was almost certain that that test would not be conducted on lines such as I myself approved. The difficulty was this, that it would have been wholly possible, in many cases, for a boy to make half marks *without knowing his text at all*; for a good half of the questions always dealt with "introduction." One had to know—that is, the boys had—not what the Apostle said himself, but what some one else said about him. This I could not believe to be right. For me, the one object was, so far as I could compass it, to make my pupils understand as of infinitely larger importance the Apostle's own pronouncements. The longer one reads St. Paul, the harder one seems to find it to be absolutely sure of his meaning in any section.'

Zones of the Spirit is the title which has been given to the English translation of August Strindberg's *Blau Buch* (Allen; 5s. net). The translation has been done by Mr. Claud Field, M.A., and it is such a translation as makes one forget wholly that it is a translation.

But who is August Strindberg? Mr. Arthur Babillotte tells us this, in the introduction which he has contributed to the volume. He was a Swede. He died last May. 'The demonic element in him, which spurred him on restlessly, made him scale heaven and fathom hell, gave him glimpses of bliss and damnation. He bore the Cain's mark on his brow: A fugitive and a wanderer shalt thou be.'

On March 29, 1897, he began the study of Swedenborg. More and more he seemed to approach Catholicism. The return to Christ was at last complete. All his faith, all his hope, now rested solely on the Crucified, whom he had once demoniacally hated. He now devoted himself entirely to the study of Swedenborg, and wrote the *Blau Buch*.

The *Blau Buch* is a volume of reflexions, about a page each in length. They are often openly Swedenborgian; they are always thankfully Christian; they are acute and astonishing. One of the reflexions had better be quoted as it stands. Let it be 'Affable Men.'

'When I have seen a character-drama, I have always asked myself, "Are men really so simple and transparent?" There is a kind of men about whom one can never be certain. They are so disposed by nature that they adapt themselves to their companions out of pure affability. Such a man once came into my circle; I found him sympathetic, lovable, good-natured. On one occasion I imparted to a third person my opinion of my affable friend. He answered, "You don't know him! He is a malicious man; he has only put on an air of affability with you."

'Then there came a fourth: "He! He is the falsest man in existence!" Finally his wife came: "No! he is neither malicious nor false; he only wants to be on good terms with people."

'At the beginning of our acquaintance (he confessed it himself later on), he had determined to win me by affability, and to preserve my affection by doing everything, or nearly everything, that I wished. He also abstained from contradicting me. During a whole year I never heard him express a view of his own; he only repeated my thoughts. I believed he had no will, no views, not even feelings. He seemed to me to be a mirror in which I was reflected; I never found him, only myself. Then I became tired of him, did not know how to hold myself in, and asked him to do something wrong. Then at last I dis-

covered the man himself. With an unparalleled strength of character, he left wife, child, and home! In order "to save his soul," as he said. "Have you then got a soul?" I asked. "Judge for yourself," he answered, and departed.

'It is dangerous to be affable, and it is dangerous to consider men simple.'

Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, speaking of the doctrine of the Eucharist, says, 'With the extraordinary latitude allowed in the Church of England to the teaching of the clergy, all possible views from absolute transubstantiation to flat Zwinglianism may be found at the present day.' What was true in 1838 is not less true in 1913. How, then, can the Rev. F. W. Worsley, M.A., B.D., who has undertaken a volume on *The Theology of the Church of England* (Chapman & Hall; 7s. 6d. net), describe the doctrine of the Eucharist? Or the doctrine of Baptism? Or the doctrine of the Church? Or any other doctrine? For it is of the whole round of teaching that Palmer's words were used, and it is of the whole round that they are true still—there is extraordinary latitude allowed to the teaching of the clergy.

Mr. Worsley has resolved to be comprehensive. He describes the extremes of doctrine, he describes the doctrine between the extremes, and leaves criticism alone. His skill is shown in being comprehensive and yet succinct and clear. Occasionally he finds relief in a footnote, in which the fulness of his knowledge and the catholicity of his mind are made manifest together.

Mr. Worsley's own sympathy is perhaps with the broad school. But the broad is not the enemy of the high or the low, only of the narrow.

What the result is of a scientific study of the Sunday School will be found in a book called *For Childhood and Youth* (Clarke & Co.; 1s. 6d. net). The author is Thiselton Mark, D.Lit., B.Sc., Lecturer on Education in the University of Manchester. Three subjects are handled—the organization of the Sunday School, the curriculum, and the teaching. Under teaching there are three divisions—the Bible as a guide to methods of teaching, the use of the Bible in class teaching, and sources of Sunday School power. Under the last subdivision one thing is laid emphasis on beyond all else—that the teaching in the Sunday School must reach the *will* of the scholar.

The first subject that is to be discussed at the Pan-Presbyterian Council in June is the subject of Authority in Religion. For it enters into nearly every Christian doctrine, and profoundly affects Christian life. Now the question of authority falls back sooner or later upon the question of the inspiration of the Bible. For the last authority is Christ, and for Christ—what He said, what He did, what He was, and even what He is—we are dependent on the Scriptures. Even before the subject of authority is directly discussed, it will be necessary to come to some understanding on inspiration.

It is therefore with peculiar pleasure that we can commend a book on the doctrine of inspiration which has been published by the Rev. John Puleston Jones, M.A. (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). Its title is *Until the Day Dawn*, which we fear will suggest eschatology and warn some off who would greatly benefit by the reading of the book. But those who read it will benefit. For the scholarship of the author is reliable, and he has been able to write firmly and yet considerately. In no time he finds himself close to Christ. The chapter on 'Christ the Test of Inspiration' is particularly pleasing. 'Christ,' he says, 'produces conviction in the realm of thought on precisely the same terms on which He wins allegiance in the realm of conduct. In the one case as in the other, the surrender is complete; but it is a willing surrender—the surrender of a rational being.'

There are writers still who use the spelling 'Mahomet' for the name of the prophet. The only spelling that should ever be used is 'Muhammad.' And if a dot is placed below the *h* to show which guttural it is, any one can pronounce it correctly. This is Canon Sell's spelling in his new biography, *The Life of Muḥammad* (Christian Literature Society for India). As the spelling of the name, so the biography is accurate and up to date. Dr. Sell has made Muḥammadanism a lifelong study, and he is studying it still, so that no new interpretation or fact escapes him. Yet with all its learning the biography may be easily and pleasantly read by anybody.

To the series entitled the 'Islam Series,' edited by Canon Sell, the Rev. W. R. W. Gardner, M.A., has contributed *The Doctrine of Man*. By means of this series the Koran and its commentaries are for the first time made accessible and intelligible to the whole world.

Within a volume of 55 small pages Dr. Henry C. Sheldon offers us an interpretation of Eucken's philosophy and a criticism of the theology implied by it. The title is *Rudolf Eucken's Message to our Age* (New York: Eaton & Mains; 35 cents). The interpretation is quite elementary and quite sufficient for the beginner. The criticism is both kindly and acute.

If you would understand what religion means in life, read *Religion and Life* by Professor T. Cuming Hall of Union Theological Seminary, New York (Eaton & Mains; 75 cents net). Professor Hall defines Religion. This is his definition: 'Religion is an inward attitude of reverent relationship to that which is thought of as for the time of supreme moment, resulting in outward expressions, personal and social, that form complexes of rites, beliefs, and customs.'

It is a definition that is purposely vague and general, but it serves to bring Religion and life together, and enable this author to show how great has been the influence of Religion on life from the beginning until now. But is its influence on the wane? Not by any means. In Professor Hall's competent judgment, it is more extensive and also more intensive than ever it was.

At the end of every chapter Dr. Hall gives a list of literature. It shows the control he has of the vast subject. But he has not summarized the literature; he has written out of his own soul's deep conviction.

The Most Beautiful Book ever Written (Eaton & Mains; 75 cents net)—which is that? Renan said it was St. Luke's Gospel. Professor D. A. Hayes of the Garrett Biblical Institute, not agreeing with Renan in much, agrees with him heartily in this, and writes his own book to prove it. He writes first on St. Luke—a brief, bright, and brotherly biography,—and then on St. Luke's Gospel. The Gospel is called the Gospel for the Gentiles, the Gospel of an Educated Man, the Gospel of the Physician, the Gospel of Childhood, the Gospel of Womanhood, the Gospel for the Poor, the Gospel for the Outcasts, and the Gospel of Praise. On each of these topics Professor Hayes says pleasant, warm-hearted things, never forgetting that it is his business to prove that this Gospel is the most beautiful book ever written.

Dr. Agar Beet has fought bravely and long for his doctrine of the last things, and he is not done fighting. Very wisely he appeals now to the average man, stating his doctrine with brevity, clearness, and temperance in a book which he calls *The Last Things in Few Words* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net).

Dr. Eugene Stock has written a short biography of Bishop Thomas Valpy French of Lahore. For the biography by the Rev. H. A. Birks, in two volumes, is out of print, and French seems to run the risk of being forgotten. He must not be forgotten. He was one of the greatest missionaries and one of the best men of his day. The title is *An Heroic Bishop* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net).

Principal H. B. Workman, M.A., D.Lit., has written three 'Chapters in the History of Christian Renunciation.' The first 'chapter' was his book on *Persecution in the Early Church*. The second 'chapter' is his book, just published, on *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal* (Kelly; 5s. net). The third chapter is a *History of Early Missions* which is about to be published by the Student Volunteer Christian Union.

The book before us, then, is the second chapter of a comprehensive scheme. This has to be kept in mind. But we cannot find that the scheme in any way affects the independence of the volume. As a sketch of the history of the Monastic ideal—of that conception of the Christian life which those men held who fled for refuge from the snares of the world to the dens and caves of the earth—it stands by itself, apart not merely from Dr. Workman's other 'chapters,' but also from the literature of the subject. Nowhere else will the history be found within this compass, with this grasp of the ideal in all its modifications, or with this accuracy in detail. It is a great surprise that a man of affairs, the head of a College, has found it possible to do so much first-hand work in a manner so finished and reliable.

The man who can condense a great Church's missionary enterprise into the compass of a primer has an enviable gift, whatever name the gift may be known by. This has been done for the Missions of the United Free Church of Scotland by the Rev. A. Duff Watson, B.D. The primer

is called *Our Missionary Heritage* (Edinburgh; 6d. net). Not only is the work all here, but it is here so that its history can be read with pleasure and its character conceived impressively. The author has even found space for the terse telling of some of those incidents which bring the foreign missionary's work home to our firesides. We see him at his work; we are moved to work and hope with him.

Under the title of *The Soul of India* (Kingsgate Press; 5s. net) the Rev. George Howells, M.A., B.Litt., B.D., Ph.D., has written what he himself calls 'An Introduction to the Study of Hinduism in its Historical Setting and Development, and in its Internal and Historical Relations to Christianity.' It is just such a book as will give those who are interested in India in its religious aspect all they require in order that they may understand the situation in that vast land with which the missionary has to deal. For Mr. Howells has, first of all, given an account of the Land, its Languages, and its Races; next, he has offered an historical survey of Indian Civilization; then he has traced the Evolution of Indian Religion and Philosophy; after that he has made a Comparative Study of Hinduism and Christianity; and, last of all, he has brought Hinduism and Christianity into historical contact.

To do all this demanded space. But he has got it. The book is a closely printed crown octavo of more than six hundred pages. And he has used his space with the utmost skill. For he seems to have mastered each separate portion of his vast subject before he began to write, and his style is precise. The very look of the book is attractive; the handling of it is a growing pleasure. It is difficult to believe that this direct narrative, this well-proportioned history of a great race and a great religious enterprise, could ever have been spoken from the platform. Yet the main portion of the book, we are told, formed the course of Angus Lectures delivered in Regent's Park College, London, in the winter session of 1909–10.

What evidence is there outside the New Testament and the Christian writers themselves for the fact of Christ? Mr. Samuel E. Stokes has gathered it together—from Tacitus, Pliny, Lucian, and the rest—and has set it forth plainly in *The Gospel according to the Jews and Pagans* (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net). The Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, has verified every statement in the book and seen it through the press. It was written to make Christianity more credible to Hindus: it will undoubtedly help weak believers, perhaps even convince unbelievers, in this land.

That we cannot get young people to see that the Bible is real, is the constant complaint of teachers. One way which has been found successful is to bring it into touch with the history of the wider world. Tell the children something about the Assyrians, and then bring the Assyrians and the prophets of Israel together. This can be done excellently by means of a book written by Miss Eleanor Trotter, B.A., and called *Life in Olden Times in Babylon and Assyria* (Macdonald & Evans; 1s. 6d.).

Of the many-sided St. Paul, one of the most interesting sides is his relation to his friends. But his relation to his friends is more than interesting; it is a vital element in the Apostle's history, and it is the occasion of some of the most difficult problems in that history. We have only to think of the names of Luke and Timothy. Seeing this clearly, the Rev. E. Basil Redlich, M.A., has written a volume, entitled *St. Paul and his Companions* (Macmillan; 5s. net), in which he has investigated every problem, pursued the Apostle throughout his ministry, and demonstrated once for all how great a genius for friendship he had, and how fundamentally it told upon his work. The volume contains a short biography of every man and woman with whom St. Paul was intimately acquainted. And each biography gains enormously in value by its setting. But it is for St. Paul's sake that all this is done, that we may understand him better, and understanding him better may more than ever be followers of him as he was a follower of Christ.

Even to gather together, as Mr. Redlich does, the designations used by the Apostle for his friends is an education in friendship. They are: 'Approved in Christ' (Apelles, Ro 16^{10}); 'My beloved' (Epænetus and Stachys, also Ampliatus with the addition of 'in the Lord,' Ro $16^{5.9.8}$; and Persis is 'the beloved'); 'the Brother' (Quartus, Ro 16^{23}; Sosthenes, 1 Co 1^{1}; Apollos, 1 Co 16^{12}; Timothy 2 Co 1^{1}, Col 1^{1}, Philem ^{1}; Epaphroditus, Ph 2^{25});

'the Chosen in the Lord' (Rufus, Ro 16^{13}); 'Fellow-servant' (Epaphras, Col 1^{7}; Tychicus, Col 4^{7}); 'Fellow-soldier' (Epaphroditus, Ph 2^{25}; Archippus, Philem ^{2}); 'Fellow-worker' (Prisca and Aquila, Urbanus, and others); 'Fellow-prisoner' (Andronicus and Junias, Aristarchus, and Epaphras); and 'Kinsman,' 'Minister,' 'Slave.'

A sympathetic and yet scientific history and exposition of Psychotherapy has been long desired. It has come now. A book has been published by Messrs. Macmillan, under the title of *Mind and Health* (8s. 6d. net), which discusses the subject in all its scientific phases and in all its historical manifestations. The book has been written by Mr. Edward E. Weaver, Ph.D., sometime Fellow in Clark University, and an historical introduction of sixty-four pages has been contributed to it by Dr. G. Stanley Hall, President of Clark University.

What is Psychotherapy? Psychotherapy, says Dr. Stanley Hall, 'means, properly speaking, the curing of a mental ailment; it also means the use of mental measures in effecting that cure. A broader use of the term, however, is usually understood, but for such use the word "psychotherapeutics" is preferred by some, which means the treatment of the sick by influencing the mental life.'

Its history is for the most part a history of methods of 'divine healing.' And these methods —Christian Science, the Emmanuel Movement, and the rest, are described with the utmost desire to see their worth and make known authoritatively what in them is reliable and useful. It is always easy for the 'scientific' mind to miss the essential; but Dr. Weaver is more than scientific. As we said at the beginning, he is sympathetic. And in the exercise of his sympathy he is careful to go to the fountain-head for his knowledge. His quotations are numerous, because they are part of his plan. The last chapter is called 'How the Christian Church may Heal.' It deserves the attention of the Christian Church.

Dr. Scott Nearing of the University of Pennsylvania is convinced that there is enough in the gospel to solve the whole social problem if only it were set to work upon it. The Churches must set the gospel to work. And this is all the trouble, he holds. The Churches are selfish. Still, in his most recent book on *Social Religion* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net), Dr. Nearing indulges in no cheap indignation with the Churches. He gives himself rather to the task of showing the Churches what they have to do. It is a terrible story—nearly incredible in some parts of it. Dr. Nearing says that the trade of prostitution, for example, is in Chicago 'organized to the highest point of efficiency, with cash registers,' and all the rest, so that you can tell by examining the books how many men have been 'served' by each woman in the twenty-four hours.

The Rev. Alexander Smellie, D.D., has issued a new biography of *Robert Murray McCheyne* (Meyer; 2s. 6d. net). He is quite pleased with Dr. Andrew Bonar's biography, but has come into possession of 'an altogether priceless box of McCheyne manuscripts—letters to and from his family and friends, notebooks, sermons and documents of different kinds'; and he determined to use both Andrew Bonar and the box and write a new convenient and cleverly illustrated biography. Cleverly illustrated—the illustrations by Mrs. Struthers are able to double the value of the volume.

'A First Book of Protestant and Free Church History for the Young People of the Nonconformist Churches' has been written by the Rev. J. G. Stevenson, B.A. It begins with the story of St. Pancras 'over fifteen hundred years ago.' That story is told not only clearly and simply, but in considerable fulness. And this method is wisely pursued throughout the book, for the details must be given if the child is to find a story worth listening to. We wish a little more space had been given to the Children's Crusades; but Mr. Stevenson has to come to modern days, and he has to come home. What we miss in the Children's Crusades we find to utmost satisfaction in the Pilgrim Fathers and the Pilgrim Children. In avoiding childish language Mr. Stevenson has occasionally fallen upon large general words which need translation. But he has performed a most difficult task with undoubted success. The title is *Fathers of our Faith* (Meyer; 3s. 6d.).

There is a Christ for every individual, and a complete Christ. Mr. Douglas G. Browne finds Christ beautiful. Yet it is no partial Christ. Beauty sums up all that we know of Him. First,

however, Mr. Browne gives us a careful survey of the conditions of life into which Christ came. For he must have a Christ who is truly human, however Divine, and really local, however universal. Then he comes to the beauty of the gospel of Christ and the beauty of Christ. It is an aspect of Christ which has been somewhat overlooked. It may make its appeal to an artistic age. But it is not a part of Christ; it is, as we have already said, the whole gospel of Christ and the whole Christ of the Gospels that are found to be beautiful. For beauty is harmony, and harmony with God is the first condition of our existence, the condition also into which Christ came to bring us after we had got lost.

The title which Mr. Browne has given his book is *Christ and His Age* (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net).

It is sometimes said that if the conditions were the same we should find the New Testament miracles repeated to-day. Are the conditions the same in the heart of Africa? In his book called *Garenganze: West and East* (Pickering & Inglis; 1s.), Mr. F. S. Arnot tells us that, like the 'son' in the Gospels, Njimbi 'ofttimes fell into the fire and oft into the water.' Conversion brought him not only spiritual life, but deliverance also from the fits to which he had been subject. The little book has other striking incidents, and some striking illustrations of them.

Dr. Eugene Stock has issued a second impression of his *Talks on St. Luke's Gospel* (R.T.S.; 2s.). Both man and book are known and much esteemed.

The Religious Tract Society has issued three series of *Scripture Post Cards*, each containing twelve cards (6d. net). The pictures are by Harold Copping.

In his new book, which he calls *All the Year Round* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net), Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis makes an appeal for an American National Year, after the manner of the Christian Year. 'We must make a large place for the anniversaries that celebrate the great men and events of the republic.' Last year Dr. Hillis observed such a National Year in Plymouth Church, delivering on every anniversary an appropriate address. It is the addresses thus delivered that compose this volume. The National Year is not quite complete, however, in itself. Dr. Hillis combines it with the Christian Year. We have accordingly this sequence: New Year; Abraham Lincoln; George Washington; Easter; International Arbitration; A Day in June (the recognition of Nature); Independence Day; Labour Day; Christian Unity; Thanksgiving Day; The Expansion of Puritanism; and Christmas. Every address is as pointed in expression and happy in illustration as only Dr. Hillis can make it.

A simple theory of life is maintained throughout the essays of the Rev. Cortland Myers, D.D., which are published under the title of *Making a Life* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net). It is, Do well, and it shall be well with you. And, in spite of the laughter over the late Samuel Smiles and his gospel of 'Get on,' what else can we preach to the young? There is the suspicion that that laughter was the laughter of the indolent at the industrious. No doubt life is a complex matter, more complex and mysterious than the essayist of these progressive ideas is able to recognize. But a clear, simple theory must always be good to begin with. And Dr. Myers is often quite Biblical in his teaching. The Bible bids us redeem the time: Dr. Myers has a most impressive chapter on the value of a minute.

Out of all the mission books of the season we should select and commend *Notable Women of Modern China*, by Margaret E. Burton (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). The subject is delightful, and it is handled delightfully. The ladies whose biographies are so well told and so well worth telling are Dr. Hü King Eng, Mrs. Ahok, Dr. Ida Kahn, Dr. Mary Stone, Yu Kuliang, and Anna Stone. There are photographs of them all and of certain places associated with them.

Mr. Charles Stelzle is known in the United States as a more secular 'J. B.' He writes to many newspapers on questions affecting labour, his articles being, in the phraseology that is used, 'syndicated to two hundred and fifty labor papers.' Of these articles a selection has been made. Mr. Revell publishes the book with the title of *The Gospel of Labor* (1s. 6d. net). Mr. Stelzle is a socialist, but of the evolutionary rather than the revolutionary type. He says we should not destroy existing institutions; we should slowly improve them for our use.

And he illustrates in this way: 'It was a curious process of construction, but a very effective one. The newspaper that occupied the building had outgrown its dimensions, but it seemed impossible to move to larger quarters while waiting for the new building which was to be erected upon the old site. It was therefore decided to continue doing business at the old stand, and with an occasional shift of the departments from floor to floor, the new building was finally completed, from foundation to dome, without a single interruption in the getting out of one of the most important journals in this country.'

Much ridicule has been cast, and deservedly, on the Sunday School story which brings the bad boy to a terrible and speedy end. But it is not yet laughed to shame. In a volume of sermons entitled *How to live the Christ Life* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net), the author of which is the Rev. Russell H. Conwell, we find this story: 'A mother heard some boys at the front door one Sunday morning asking her boy to go with them on a boat down the Delaware River. The mother asked them not to invite her son to accompany them, and pleaded with him, saying, "If you do not want to go to church, take the day off and rest, but do not disgrace your God and His Sabbath by such sport." I was asked to attend his funeral the following Thursday, the boy having been drowned in the river. While such physical judgment may not follow all who thus desecrate His holy name, it illustrates the fact that something dreadful does follow somewhere every person who breaks that commandment. Every man should rest one day in seven. The Lord wanted us to secure that needed rest, and for that reason He commanded it, in loving regard for His children.'

It is the author's intense desire to do good, as if, like St. Paul, he would by all means save some, that makes him fall into the telling of such a story. But even in a sermon such stories should be impossible; that they are true makes no difference.

The history of the protest in Italy against what is regarded as the tyranny of the Roman Church is told by Professor Giovanni Luzzi, D.D., of the Waldensian Theological Seminary in Florence, in a series of lectures which were delivered in America last winter, and are published under the title of *The Struggle for Christian Truth in Italy* (Revell; 5s. net).

The book as now issued contains new matter. It has seven chapters: (1) The Dawn of Christianity in Rome; (2) The Protestant Revolution and its Echo in Italy; (3) The Dramatic History of the Bible in Italy; (4) The Israel of the Alps; (5) Missionary Blossom and Evangelical Fruit in the Garden of Italy; (6) In the Land of Exile; (7) Modernism.

It is a fascinating story; almost all the elements that move the emotions and touch the imagination are in it; and it loses nothing in Professor Luzzi's telling.

How far apart even yet is the Roman Catholic from the Protestant Church may be seen with startling vividness in the translation of a book by Dr. Albert von Ruville, of the University of Halle. It is evident even in the title: *Humility the True Talisman* (Simpkin; 3s. 6d. net). It is almost painfully evident in the tone of the book throughout, which seems sometimes to belong to a different age of the world rather than a different Christian community. And if it is not recognized earlier, Dr. Ruville takes care that it shall be understood before the book is ended; for he says in concluding: 'The Church unveils herself more and more radiantly to the careful investigator, as the true and holy work of the Son of God leading up to a happiness of ever-increasing purity. Meanwhile deep shadows are gathering over the Protestant world. Doubtless there is much light there also, but it originates from Catholicism, and becomes more and more eliminated by the influence of a purely rational Science. And there is an element in all the utterances of Protestantism that is repulsive to a believing Catholic. It is the element of presumption and pride which cannot harmonize with that distinguishing mark of the Catholic Church, to which she owes her power, her unity, her organization, in short her whole being and existence; and this fundamental virtue is *Humility*.'

But in spite of the difference, the non-Roman reader may profit not a little by the reading of this book. Its insistence on Humility, albeit it is often strained and fanciful, tells at last. And it is a grace so difficult of cultivation that every aid is welcome.

Contributions and Comments.

Matthew xxii. 4.

WHILST revising my proof-sheets for a new edition of the Story of Achikar, of which I am a co-editor, I have come across one of that sage's maxims which throws a ray of light on one of our Lord's parables. It occurs in a translation of the Slavonic Version which I made from the German of Dr. Jagić. Addressing his disobedient nephew, Nadan, Achikar says (p. 6), 'My son, if one bid thee to a feast, appear not at the first summons; if he call thee a second time, thou wilt see that he esteems thee highly, and thou wilt enter his presence with honour.' This surely illustrates the fact that Oriental customs often differ widely from our own. I have read, I cannot recollect where, some remarks of a distinguished critic, which contained a scornful remark about the barbarous and impossible incident in the parable recorded by Matthew, of invited guests making excuse for not carrying out their acceptance of an invitation. Yet here is a maxim, possibly original to the ancient Babylonian tale, possibly one that has crept into the Aramaic text, or into its Slavonic version, at some period between 500 B.C. and 1400 A.D. (so wide a range have our extant MSS.), which shows us that a second summons, 'All things are ready, come to the marriage feast,' was not only permissible in Semitic circles, but was actually expected by guests who had the right of entry to Sennacherib's court. This coincidence may surely teach us the wisdom of pausing before we try to make the tales of other ages and other races conform too rigidly to our modern ideas of propriety.

The only parallel to this which I have observed, is a habit which once was prevalent at children's parties, and of which I myself have been an unwilling victim, that the little guests have sometimes been previously instructed that it is a point in good manners to decline taking any of the sweet cakes, until they are pressed to do so for the second time. Achikar may be said to have lived in the childhood of the human race.

The maxim does not occur in any other version except the Slavonic, so far as I know.

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

Cambridge.

Psalm xc. 3.

MISS KIRKPATRICK'S interesting suggestion in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—that דכא means 'contrition'—seems to leave some important considerations unnoticed.

1. Had not the poet, probably, Gn 3^{19} in his mind? There (*a*) שוב is twice used; and (*b*) דכא is (in accordance with that Hebrew poetry to which Miss Kirkpatrick appeals) naturally taken as equivalent to עפר, 'crushed earth.' As a noun דכא occurs only here. In Is 57^{15} (to which might have been added Ps 34^{19}) it is an adjective, and the sense is quite clear.

2. But the real difficulty of the verse is quite untouched by Miss Kirkpatrick, and that is the use of the Jussive form תשב. Had she argued in favour of a literal translation of this Jussive *as* a Jussive, her contribution to the discussion of a difficult passage might claim some support. A case might perhaps—but somewhat doubtfully—be made out for 'O turn thou man to contrition.' If we adhere to the most probable explanation of דכא as a poetic synonym for עפר there seem to be three principal ways in which the Jussive might be accounted for. (*a*) *Waw Consecutive* may have been omitted (cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 83). (*b*) The אל which comes at the end of v.^{2} should not be pronounced אֵל, *God*, but אַל (the particle of deprecation), and should be moved up to תשב—'O do not turn man back to dust.' Thus was אל תשב read by the LXX (*μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς*). This is adopted by Briggs ('Int. Crit. Com.,' pp. 271–276).

(*c*) The Massoretes may have been misled by a *scriptio defectiva* (omission of the *yodh*), and the word may have been intended as Imperfect, not Jussive. This explanation (unnoticed by Briggs, probably because the evidence of LXX is so strongly in favour of the Jussive) is supported by Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 109 *k*. And it would well suit the attractive suggestion of Fr. Buhl and others that vv. $^{3.4}$ should be transposed.

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

King's College, London.

The Casting out of Leaven (Ex. xiii. 7; Dt. xvi. 11).

During this festival leaven was not only forbidden as food, it was banished from the houses, that is to say, it was destroyed. After the seven days of unleavened bread new leaven must have been procured from somewhere. A similar thing happens in Lebanon to-day. At the beginning of the year the lump of leavened dough which is always kept back from one baking to leaven the next is thrown away. Fresh paste is made of flour and water and put in a cotton bag. At night a girl of the family takes this to the fountain, soaks it in the water, and then hangs it on a tree near the house till the next evening. This is done thrice. Presumably the heat of the midday sun sets up fermentation in the sodden dough.

The popular explanation is that on the third night Christ passes through the village, touches the dough and turns it into leaven. As He passes through the land all the trees bow down to Him. A benighted muleteer once tied his animal to a tree and lay down beside it to sleep. When he woke in the morning his animal was dangling in the air. This is the night of the عيد غ القطاس, Feast of Sprinkling, Epiphany. We may perhaps compare the thorn tree of Glastonbury which blossoms on the same day, Christmas day, old style.

Thus at different times in the year we find the same spring-cleaning of the household bakery among the Hebrews and the modern Syrians. The new leaven is three days in the making, for the Syrians generally bake sufficient to last three or four days.

A. S. Tritton.

Edinburgh.

Some Correspondences between the Elephantinê Papyri and the Gospels.

Any anticipations of the sayings of the Gospels are of literary interest, and so I would call attention to a few correspondences between the gnomic sayings in the proverbs of Ahikar discovered by Sachau in his Elephantinê papyri and the words or sentiment of the Gospels. There are many points of contact between the New Testament and the intertestamental literature of the Jews, *e.g.* Ecclesiasticus, 4 Maccabees, Epistle of Aristeas, and so it is not strange to find some adumbrations of the New Testament in these documents of the fifth century B.C. Still, as the story and the proverbs of Ahikar, in this their earliest form, are pagan, not Jewish, the correspondences are of more than special interest.

Professor W. R. Arnold has called attention (in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1912, p. 27) to the expression in Sachau's papyrus, No. 11, line 10, שימא שים, 'a treasure is to be laid up,' which he translates, 'a credit will be established,' and compares it phraseologically to the Lord's command to 'lay up thy treasure in heaven' (Mt $6^{19f.}$). Perhaps a correspondence of similar nature may be found in papyrus 54, line 1, which is unfortunately much mutilated:

אף לאלהין יקירה הי . . . מלכותא בשמ[י]ן שימה הי

Evidently the two predicate expressions ending in הי are parallel. Reading toward the end, with Sachau, בשמין, 'in heaven,' we obtain for the line: 'Dear is it to God, . . . (yea) the kingdom laid up (*i.e.* credited) in heaven is it.' The reference appears to be to some virtue or action meritorious toward God and to its reward. With the latter part of the saying compare Lk $12^{32f.}$: 'The Father is pleased to give you the kingdom. . . . Make for yourself purses that grow not old, a treasure unfailing in the heavens.' At least there is a tempting similarity in the sound of words between the two dicta. In this connexion it may be noticed that the evangelical phrase of the heavenly treasure is of Jewish, not Christian origin: it is found in Ecclus 29^{11} (Swete's enumeration): 'Set thy treasure in the commands of the Highest.'

In papyrus 57, col. 1, line 13 f., occurs the following dictum (as I would read it):

הן יאחזן בכנפי לבשך שבק בידה אחר ארני
לשמש הו . . . [י]לקח זי לה וינתן לך

The commentators have made little or nothing of this saying, although Ungnad has noticed the plausible parallel to Mt 5^{40}. By understanding ארני as the participle passive of רנא, with prothetic א, I obtain the following sense: 'If a bad man take hold of the skirts of thy clothing, leave it in his hand. After he has bethought himself of Shamash (the god of justice), he will take of his own and give it to thee.' This is nothing else than

the doctrine of non-resistance to evil, the evil man being converted from the error of his ways by his recollection of Shamash. The saying is the more striking because it is pagan.

In this connexion may be noticed a maxim in the same papyrus, line 2, which breathes a good deal of the Pauline spirit of the freedom that is found in the right relation to God. It reads: 'Let a man keep himself (*i.e.* be on his guard) with God, and he shall not have to guard against his inner sin(fulness).' The thought is far in advance upon the grovelling fear before secret sins which we find in Ps 19^{12}, and elsewhere in the Old Testament.

Finally there is a passage in which a verbal identity is attractive, although possibly misleading. It is found in papyrus 56, col. 1, l. 13:

לא יתרום בשם אבוהי ובשם אמה אל ידנח
שמ[שא] . . . כי גבר לחה הו

Now יתרום is etymologically a variant of יתרון, 'advantage.' How much of the right hand of the papyrus margin is torn off we do not know; if we may supplete a few words at the beginning, we get: 'If a man say, no advantage (is there) in the name of his father and in the name of his mother, let not the sun rise (upon him?), for a cursed man he is.' The excoriated utterance may refer to the honour coming from father or mother, which the unworthy son rejects, 'name' being an equivalent to honour, and for the sentiment we may compare Ec $3^{1\text{-}16}$ and in especial v.^{11}: 'The glory of a man is from the honour of his father.' But בשם is also good Semitic for 'to the account of,' and accepting this turn of the phrase we may read: 'If a man say, there is no profit (advantage) to the account of his father or his mother,' etc. If so, we have an indubitable parallel, in one word and in the spirit of the whole to our Lord's denunciation of the principle of Korban in Mt 15^{5}: 'That wherein thou mightest have been profited is *korban*.' In both cases there is the circumvention of filial duty, in the latter case under a religious pretext. It is to be noticed that the imprecation at the end of this saying is in contrast to the broader wisdom of Jesus expressed in Mt 5^{45}: 'He makes the sun to rise upon the just and the unjust.'

The reader may possibly be acquainted with various striking coincidences between the later forms of the Ahikar legend, especially the Syriac version, and the Gospels. They are fully discussed by Dr. J. Rendel Harris in the introduction to his *Story of Ahikar*.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.
Philadelphia Divinity School, U.S.A.

A Note on Psalm lxxi. 18.

PSALM 71^{18} has given much trouble to translators and commentators. As the passage is one of the most beautiful in the Bible, the more is the pity that the text should be inaccurate, as undoubtedly it is. It reads, in its present form, as follows:

וגם עד זקנה ושיבה אלהים אל תעזבני
עד אניד זרועך לְדוֹר לְכָל־יבוא גבורתֶך

The words לְדוֹר and לכל יבוא are the ones that present the difficulty. The Targum gets out of the latter by adding a word. It simply translates לְדֹר דָּרֵי, as if the text had לדור דורות. The Vulgate, following the Septuagint, translates: 'Donc annuntiem brachium tuum generationi omni quae ventura est,' as if the text were לכל דור יבוא, and then takes גבורתֶך over into the following verse. The Revised Version reads: 'Yea, even when I am old and grey-headed, O God, forsake me not; until I have declared thy strength unto the next generation, thy might to every one that is to come.' This means an insertion of the adjective 'the next' into the text, and follows the suggestion of some older commentators—*e.g.* Ibn Ezra. Rashi, on the other hand, construed לכל יבוא to refer not to the future, but rather literally to 'all comers': 'That I might declare thy might to all that may come to me.'

Among modern commentators, Duhm (in *K.H.C.*) follows the LXX and carries גבורתך over into the following verse, and reads עד instead of עַד, and instead of the words לדור and לכל יבוא, לכל הדור יבוא. As an old man, Duhm suggests, the poet could not possibly have hoped to be able in person to declare the might of Yahweh to future generations; his desire must have been to prophesy concerning it. It does not matter, he adds, whether in construing the verse we regard לכל הדור as dative to אניד, or combine the ל with זרוע and treat it as a poetic substitute for על. Disregarding the latter suggestion, the verse would read עד אניד

זרועך לכל הדור יבוא. Such a reconstruction, we cannot but feel, destroys the balance and beauty of the passage.

Kautzsch translates: 'That I may declare Thine arm to the (next) generation, Thy strength to all that are yet to come'—admitting that the text is bad, and that the insertion of the word 'next' is dictated by necessity.

Briggs, also, admits the difficulty of the passage, and translates as follows: 'Until I declare Thy wondrous deeds to a seed, To a generation to come Thy might.' He does not make it clear, however, just how he would read the Hebrew.

It seems to me that by a very simple transposition of two words, and a slight change of punctuation, both the balance and the meaning of the verse can be saved. Read

עַד אַגִּיד זְרוֹעֲךָ לַכֹּל
לְדוֹר יָבוֹא גְּבוּרָתֶךָ

and translate

> Until I have declared Thy strength unto all,
> Thy might unto the next generation.

This makes good Hebrew (cf. for לַכֹּל, Ps 145[9], Eccl 10[8]), preserves the parallelism without violence to the original, and, *pace* Professor Duhm, the aspiration it voices is quite true to the optimistic and yearnful faith of the Biblical poets.

H. G. Enelow.

Louisville, Ky.

Entre Nous.

Bohn.

'The usefullest thing I know,' said Carlyle. And this time all the world agrees with him. But Bohn has been expensive. For one Bohn leads to another, from the sheer worth of the books. And sometimes several volumes had to be bought to complete a great book or some great author's works. Now the whole of the Bohn's Libraries are to be issued at the price of one shilling net each volume. The first twenty volumes are ready. They make a great show on the shelf. They are printed on good paper, thin and opaque, and they are bound in various colours and shades of colour. They will catch the eye in any library and not displease it.

What are the books covered by these twenty volumes? *Gulliver's Travels*, Motley's *Dutch Republic* (3 vols.), Emerson's *Works* (2 vols.), Burton's *Pilgrimage to Meccah* (2 vols.), Lamb's *Elia and Eliana*, Hooper's *Waterloo*, *Joseph Andrews*, *Don Quixote* (2 vols.), Calverley's *Theocritus and Eclogues of Virgil*, *Evelina*, Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, *Poetry and Truth from my own Life* by Goethe (2 vols.), Ebers' *An Egyptian Princess*, and Young's *Travels in France*.

Here, then, for a single pound is reading for the rest of the year. And each volume is so convenient in size that it may be carried comfortably in the pocket, or held comfortably in the hand a whole evening through.

This is the cheap literature we should both read and recommend. The publishers are Messrs. George Bell & Sons.

In the Name of Jesus.

'Perhaps no class of promises has been more misunderstood than those which bid us ask "in the name of Jesus." Many good people have actually thought that to conclude a petition with the words, "For Jesus' sake," is to guarantee the answer. But, surely, Jesus did not mean to give us his name to be used as a shibboleth. To ask in his name must be something more than these people think. Jesus has underwritten our prayer—but not all our petitions. John has given us the key: "If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us" (1 Jn 5. 14); and again, "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you" (Jn 15. 7). To ask in the name of Jesus is to ask according to his mind; to pray as he would pray; to stand related to the Father as he stands. Then, and then only, do we ask, "in his name," assured that we shall obtain the things we ask for.'

These necessary words are taken from a highly artistic booklet published by Messrs. Eaton & Mains of New York, of which the title is *The Heart of Prayer*, and the author the Rev. C. W. M'Cormick.

The People's Books.

Messrs. T. C. & E. C. Jack have now issued the 'sixth dozen' volumes of their 'People's

Books' (6d. net each), which they describe with perfect propriety as 'a Library of new books by writers of distinction, bringing within the reach of all the results of modern knowledge.' The range of subject is: (1) Science, (2) Philosophy and Religion, (3) History, (4) Social and Economic, and (5) Letters. That is the publishers' own division. The volumes just issued touch all these departments. In Science we have *Youth and Sex*, by Mary Scharlieb, M.D., M.S., and F. Arthur Sibly, M.A., LL.D.; *British Birds*, by F. B. Kirkman, B.A.; *Gardening*, by A. Cecil Bartlett; and *The Science of Sight*, by P. Phillips, D.Sc. In Philosophy and Religion we find *Ethics*, by Canon Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt.; *The Problem of Truth*, by H. Wildon Carr, D.Litt.; and *Judaism*, by Ephraim Levine, M.A. One volume only has been contributed to History, *The Oxford Movement*, by Wilfrid Ward. The Social and Economic section has been increased by two volumes, *Trade Unions*, by Joseph Clayton, and *Mediæval Socialism*, by Bede Jarrett, O.P., M.A. Last of all there are two biographies which belong to the class called Letters, *Charles Lamb*, by Flora Masson, and *Shelley*, by Sydney Waterlow, M.A.

New Periodicals.

The spring season has seen the birth of three theological periodicals, *The Constructive Quarterly*, 'A Journal of Faith, Work, and Thoughts of Christendom,' edited by Silas McBee (Frowde; 3s. net); *Faith and Doubt*, 'A Magazine of Discussion' (Seminary Press; 6d. net); and *The New Commentator*, 'A Quarterly Cambridge Paper for the Discussion of Current Religious and Theological Questions' (Heffer; 3d.).

We like *The New Commentator* best, though we do not like its name. It is a sort of theological *Spectator* or *Nation*, being of that size and appearance and having some at least of the features. And it is out of sight most original. If originality will float a periodical, Mr. Hart's article on the title 'Son of Man' should be sufficient for *The New Commentator*.

We must notice also *The Calcutta Review* (Calcutta General Pub. Co.), which commenced a new series with the January number. Two articles in this number strike us as particularly good, 'Shakespeare, the Last Phase,' by Nicol MacNicol, M.A., D.Litt., and 'Early Buddhism in the West,' by J. C. Matthew, M.A.

New Poetry.

Mr. Edward Carpenter commends *Voices of Dawn over the Hills*, by Rose E. Sharland (Arrowsmith; 1s. net), to all those who care about the labour movement of to-day, 'because out of the heart of that movement it not only gives voice to the longing for a more natural and gracious life than is now possible, but also, like the apparition of a snowdrop in Spring, bears with it some promise of glad fulfilment.'

Here is one of the Songs—

THE UNEXPRESSED.

Day comes as it goes,
In soft amber and rose
  Dissolved in dim amethyst lakes;
And no poet has told
Half its glory of gold,
  Or the thoughts that such beauty awakes.

Life comes as it goes,
Like the wind when it blows,
  On earth but a moment alit;
Yet never was sung
By most eloquent tongue
  The meaning and glory of it.

Two of Ella Wheeler Wilcox's volumes are bound in one with the title of *Poems of Life and Moments*, and published by Messrs. Siegle, Hill & Co. (2s. 6d. net). The binding is a beautiful soft brown leather. The poems are of many of life's experiences, but especially the experiences of love and sorrow. This is one of them—

CONVERSION.

When this world's pleasures for my soul sufficed,
  Ere my heart's plummet sounded depths of pain,
I called on reason to control my brain,
And scoffed at that old story of the Christ.

But when o'er burning wastes my feet had trod,
  And all my life was desolate with loss,
With bleeding hands I clung about the cross,
And cried aloud, 'Man needs a suffering God!'

Mr. Claud Field has called his little book of poetry *Puritan Pansies* (Gay & Hancock). It is attractively prepared for presentation. Here is one of the pansies—

OXFORD.

Her stones are dreams,
  Her river is a thought,
She is not what she seems,
  A city mason-wrought;
Descended from the sky,
  Like John's Jerusalem,
She lets the years go by,
  But is not touched by them.

The Rev. C. Venn Pilcher, B.D., has translated some of the hymns sung in the churches of Iceland. The volume, which is called *The Passion-Hymns of Iceland* (Robert Scott; 2s. net), has come as a surprise to the Bishop of Durham, who writes a foreword to it, and to many another. The surprise is that the hymns are so like our own. Some of them could easily be adopted, in Mr. Pilcher's translation, into our hymn books. We offer one of the shortest by way of sample. Its author is Páll Jónsson. But the greater number translated are either by Hallgrim Petursson or Bishop Valdimar Briem.

VESPER HYMN.

On the wings of light declining
  Sinks the westering sun to sleep:
Lord, alike in dark or shining,
  Thy pure eyes their vigil keep.
Let Thy light, which faileth never,
  Round me shine, though day depart;
And, though night prevaileth, ever
  Flood the chambers of my heart.

Editorials.

When Professor Shailer Mathews edited *The World To-day* he contributed to its pages pointed paragraphs on passing events and emotions. These paragraphs he has been well advised to republish, and they appear in an attractive little volume with the title *The Making of To-morrow* (Eaton & Mains; $1 net). Those who have hitherto known Dr. Mathews only as a writer on the New Testament will be astonished at the knowledge of secular affairs which he possesses, and at the terse modern style in which he can express himself. Take the first note on 'Give us back our Rivers!'

'Civilization, like Moses, got its first start on water. Until recent times there never was a nation that did not paddle or sail its way into history. Look in your general histories to find the proof.

'The United States was born of water. It was easier to get to New Orleans from Montreal by way of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi than over land.

'In those early days rivers were thoroughfares. They continued to be thoroughfares until the middle of the last century.

'Now they are used mostly for sewerage and drinking water.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Robert Hughes, Alsager.

Illustrations of the Great Text for July must be received by the 1st of June. The text is Jn 3^{8}.

The Great Text for August is Ps 31^{15}—'My times are in thy hand.' A copy of Thorburn's *Jesus the Christ*, or any volume of 'The Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is Ac 11^{24}—'For he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.' A copy of Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for October is Lk 14^{18}—'And they all with one consent began to make excuse.' A copy of Strahan's *The Book of Job*, or of any volume of the Great Texts of the Bible, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for November is Ph 4^{13}—'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.' A copy of Dean's *Visions and Revelations*, or of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Clifford's *Gospel of Gladness*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.